

C E N T.
VII.
P A R T II.

The coun-
cil called
Quinisex-
tum.

XII. Neither the sixth general council, in which the Monothelites were condemned, nor the fifth, which had been assembled in the preceding century, had determined any thing concerning ecclesiastical discipline or religious ceremonies. To supply this defect, a new assembly of bishops was held pursuant to the order of JUSTINIAN II. in a spacious hall of the imperial palace called *Trullus*, i. e. *Cúpola*, from the form of the building. This council, which met A. D. 692, was called *Quinisextum*, as we had occasion to observe formerly, from its being considered, by the Greeks, as a supplement to the fifth and sixth œcumenical councils, and as having given to the acts of these assemblies the degree of perfection which they had hitherto wanted. There are yet extant an hundred and two laws, which were enacted in this council, and which related to the external celebration of divine worship, the government of the church, and the lives and manners of Christians. Of these there are six, which are diametrically opposite to several opinions and rites of the Romish church; for which reason the Roman pontiffs have refused to adopt, without restriction, the decisions of this council, or to reckon it in the number of those called *œcumenical*, though

dissertation concerning the origin of the Maronites. Even the learned ASSERINUS, himself a Maronite, and who has spared no pains to defend his nation * against the reproach in question, acknowledges ingenuously, that, among the arguments used by NAIRON and others in favour of the Maronites, there are a great many destitute of force. See JO. MORINUS, *De Ordin. Sacris*, p. 380. RICH. SIMON, *Histoire Critique des Chrétiens Orientaux*, chap. xiii. p. 146. EUSEB. RENAUDOT, *Historia Patriarchar. Alexandrinor.* p. 149. and *Præf. ad Liturgias Orientales*. LE BRUN, *Explication de la Messe*, tom. ii. p. 626. *Paris*. 1726. The arguments of the contending parties are enumerated impartially, in such a manner as leaves the decision to the reader, by LE QUIEN, in his *Oriens Christianus*, tom. iii. p. 10.

* See *Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican.* tom. i. p. 496.

they

they look upon the greatest part of its decrees as worthy of applause [u].

C E N T.
VII.
P A R T II.

[u] See FRANC. PAGI *Breviar. Pontif. Roman.* tom. i. p. 486. CHRIST LUPUS, *Dissertat. de Concilio Trullano, in Notis et Dissertat. ad Concilia*, tom. iii. opp. p. 168. The Roman Catholics reject the following decisions of this council: 1. The fifth *canon*, which approves of the eighty-five apostolical canons commonly attributed to CLEMENT. 2. The thirteenth *canon*, which allows the priests to marry. 3. The fifty-fifth *canon*, which condemns the sabbath fast, that was an institution of the Latin church. 4. The sixty-seventh *canon*, which prescribes the most rigorous abstinence from blood and things strangled. 5. The eighty-second *canon*, which prohibits the representing CHRIST under the image of a lamb. 6. The thirty-sixth *canon*, concerning the equal rank and authority of the bishops of *Rome* and *Constantinople*.

AN
ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.

BOOK THE THIRD.

CONTAINING THE
HISTORY OF THE CHURCH,

FROM
CHARLEMAGNE

TO
THE REFORMATION BY LUTHER.

T H E
E I G H T H C E N T U R Y,

P A R T I.

The External HISTORY of the CHURCH.

C H A P T E R I.

*Concerning the prosperous events which happened to
the church during this century.*

I. **W**HILE the Mahometans were infesting with their arms, and adding to their conquests, the most flourishing provinces of *Asia*, and oblcuring, as far as their influence could extend, the lustre and glory of the rising church, the Nestorians of *Chaldea* were carrying the lamp of Christianity among those barbarous nations, called Scythians by the ancients, and by the moderns, Tartars, who, independent on the Saracen yoke, had fixed their habitations within the limits of mount *Imaus*[a]. It is now well known,

C E N T.
VIII.
P A R T I.

The gospel
propagated
in Hyrcania
and Tartary.

[a] The southern regions of *Scythia* were divided by the ancients (to whom the northern were unknown) into three parts, namely *Scythia within*, and *Scythia beyond Imaus*, and *Sarmatia*. It is of the first of these three that Dr. MOSHEIM speaks as enlightened at this time with the knowledge of the gospel; and it comprehended *Turkestan* and *Mongal*, the *Uzbek*, or *Zagata*, *Kalmuc* and *Nogayan Tartary*, which were peopled by the *Bactrians*, *Sogdians*, *Gandarians*, and *Massagetes*, not to mention the land of *Siberia*, *Samoyedes*, and *Nova Zembla*, which were uninhabited in ancient times.

that

CENT.
VIII.
PART I.

that TIMOTHĒUS, the Nestorian pontif, who had been raised to that dignity A. D. 778, converted to the Christian faith, by the ministry of SUBCHAL JESU, whom he had consecrated bishop, first the Gelæ and Dailamites, by whom a part of *Hyrcania* was inhabited; and afterwards, by the labours of other missionaries, the rest of the nations, who had formed settlements in *Hyrcania*, *Bactria*, *Margiana*, and *Sogdia* [b]. It is also certain, that Christianity enjoyed in these vast regions, notwithstanding the violent attacks of the Mahometans to which it was sometimes exposed, the advantages of a firm and solid establishment for a long course of ages; while the bishops, by whose ministry it was propagated, and supported, were all consecrated by the sole authority of the Nestorian pontif.

The Germans converted by Boniface.

II. If we turn our eyes towards Europe, we find many nations that were as yet unenlightened with the knowledge of the gospel. Almost all the Germans (if we except the Bavarians, who had embraced Christianity under THEODORIC, or THIERRY, the son of CLOVIS, and the eastern Franks, with a few other provinces) lay buried in the grossest darkness of Pagan superstition. Many attempts were made, by pious and holy men, to infuse the truth into the minds of these savage Germans; and various efforts were used for the same purpose by kings and princes, whose interest it was to propagate a religion that was so adapted to mitigate and tame the ferocity of these warlike nations; but neither the attempts of pious zeal, nor the efforts of policy, were attended with success. This great work was, however, effected in this century, by the ministry of WINFRID, a

[b] THOMAS MARGENSIS, *Historiæ Monasticæ*, lib. iii. in JOS. SIM. ASSIMANNI *Bibliotheca Orient. Vatic.* tom. iii. pars I. p. 491. See also this latter work, tom. iii. pars II. cap. ix. § 5. p. 478.

Benedictine monk, born in *England* of illustrious parents, and afterwards known by the name of **BONIFACE**. This famous ecclesiastic, attended by two companions of his pious labours, passed over into *Friesland*, A. D. 715, to preach the gospel to the people of that country, but this first attempt was unsuccessful; and a war breaking out between **RADBOD**, the king of that country, and **CHARLES MARTEL**, our zealous missionary returned to *England*. He resumed, however, his pious undertaking in the year 719; and being solemnly impowered, by the Roman pontif **GREGORY II.** to preach the gospel not only in *Friesland*, but all over *Germany*, he performed the functions of a Christian teacher among the Thuringians, Frieslanders, and Hessians, with considerable success [c].

III. This eminent missionary was, in the year 723, consecrated bishop by **GREGORY II.** who changed the name of **WINEFRID** into that of **BONIFACE**; seconded also by the powerful protection, and encouraged by the liberality of **CHARLES MARTEL**, mayor of the palace to **CHILPERIC** king of *France*, he resumed his ministerial labours among the Hessians and Thuringians, and finished with glory the task he had undertaken, in which he received considerable assistance from a number of pious and learned men, who repaired to him from *England* and *France*. As the Christian churches erected by **BONIFACE** were too numerous to be governed by one bishop, this prelate was advanced to the dignity of archbishop, in the year 738, by **GREGORY III.** by whose authority, and the auspicious protection of **CARLOMAN** and **PEPIN**,

Other pious exploits of this famous missionary, and his advancement in the church.

[c] An ample account of this eminent man is to be found in a learned dissertation of **GUDENIUS**, *De S. Bonifacio Germanorum Apostolo*, published in 4to at *Helmstad* in the year 1722. See also **JO. AL. FABRICII Biblioth. Latina mediævi.** tom. i. p. 709. *Hist. Littér. de la France*, tom. iv. p. 92. **MABILLON**, in *Annalibus Benedictinis*, &c.

C E N T. the sons of CHARLES MARTEL, he founded, in
 VIII. Germany, the bishoprics of *Wurtzburg*, *Bura-*
 P A R T I. *bourg*, *Erfurt*, and *Aichstädt*: to which he added,
 in the year 744, the famous monastery of *Fulda*.
 His last promotion, and the last recompence of
 his assiduous labours in the propagation of the
 truth, was his advancement to the archiepiscopal
 see of *Mentz*, A. D. 746, by ZACHARY, bishop
 of *Rome*, by whom he was, at the same time,
 created primate of *Germany* and *Belgium*. In his
 old age, he returned again to *Friesland*, that he
 might finish his ministry in the same place where
 he had entered first upon its functions: but his
 piety was ill rewarded by that barbarous people,
 by whom he was murdered in the year 755,
 while fifty ecclesiastics, who accompanied him in
 this voyage, shared the same unhappy fate.

The judg-
 ment we
 are to form
 concerning
 the apostle-
 ship of Bo-
 niface.

IV. BONIFACE, on account of his ministerial
 labours and holy exploits, was distinguished by
 the honourable title of the *Apostle of the Germans*;
 nor, if we consider impartially the eminent ser-
 vices he rendered to Christianity, will this title
 appear to have been undeservedly bestowed. But
 it is necessary to observe, that this eminent pre-
 late was an apostle of modern fashion, and had,
 in many respects, departed from the excellent
 model exhibited in the conduct and ministry of
 the primitive and true apostles. Besides his zeal
 for the glory and authority of the Roman pontif,
 which equalled, if it did not surpass, his zeal for
 the service of CHRIST, and the propagation of
 his religion [d], many other things unworthy of a

[d] The French Benedictine monks ingenuously confess that
 BONIFACE was an over-zealous partisan of the Roman pontif,
 and attributed more authority to him than was just and fitting.
 Their words, in their *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. iv.
 p. 106. are as follows: "Il exprime son dévouement pour le
 " S. Siege en des termes qui ne sont pas assez proportionnés à
 " la dignité du caractère épiscopal."

truly

truly Christian minister are laid to his charge. In combating the Pagan superstitions, he did not always use those arms, with which the ancient heralds of the gospel gained such victories in behalf of the truth; but often employed violence and terror, and sometimes artifice and fraud, in order to multiply the number of Christians. His *epistles*, moreover, discover an imperious and arrogant temper; a cunning and insidious turn of mind; an excessive zeal for increasing the honours and pretensions of the sacerdotal order; and a profound ignorance of many things of which the knowledge was absolutely necessary in an apostle, and particularly of the true nature and genius of the Christian religion.

CENT.
VIII.
PART II.

V. The famous prelate, of whom we have been now speaking, was not the only Christian minister, who attempted to deliver the *German* nations from the miserable bondage of Pagan superstition; several others signalized their zeal in the same laudable and pious undertaking. CORBINIAN, a French Benedictine monk, after having laboured with vast assiduity and fervour in planting the gospel among the Bavarians, and other countries, became bishop of *Friesingen* [e]. FIRMIN, a Gaul by birth, preached the gospel under various kinds of suffering and opposition in *Alsatia*, *Bavaria*, and *Helvetia*, now *Switzerland*, and had inspection over a considerable number of monasteries [f]. LEBLIN, an Englishman, laboured with the most ardent zeal and assiduity to engage the fierce and warlike Saxons, and also the Frieslanders, Belgæ, and other nations, to receive the light of Christianity; but his ministry was attended with very

Other apostles preach the gospel to the Germans.

[e] BARONIUS, *Annal. Eccles.* tom. viii. ad An. DCCXVI. § 10. CAR. MAICHELBECK, *Historiæ Friesingensis*, tom. i.

[f] HERM. BRUSCHII *Chronologia Monaster. German.* p. 30. ANTON. PAGI *Critica in Anrales Baronii*, tom. ii. ad An. DCCLIX. § 9. *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 124.

C E N T.
VIII.
PART I.

The expe-
dition of
Charle-
magne a-
gainst the
Saxons.

little fruit [g]. We pass over in silence several apostles of less fame; nor is it necessary to mention WILLIBROD, and others of superior reputation, who persisted now with great alacrity and constancy in the labours they had undertaken, in the preceding century, in order to the propagation of divine truth.

VI. A war broke out, at this time, between CHARLEMAGNE and the Saxons, which contributed much to the propagation of Christianity, though not by the force of a rational persuasion. The Saxons were, at this time, a numerous and formidable people, who inhabited a considerable part of Germany, and were engaged in perpetual quarrels with the Franks concerning their boundaries and other matters of complaint. Hence CHARLEMAGNE turned his arms against this powerful nation, A. D. 772, with a design, not only to subdue that spirit of revolt with which they had so often troubled the empire, but also to abolish their idolatrous worship, and engage them to embrace the Christian religion. He hoped, by their conversion, to vanquish their obstinacy, imagining that the divine precepts of the gospel would assuage their impetuous and restless passions, mitigate their ferocity, and induce them to submit more tamely to the government of the Franks. These projects were great in idea, but difficult in execution; accordingly, the first attempt to convert the Saxons, after having subdued them, was unsuccessful, because it was made, without the aid of violence or threats, by the bishops and monks, whom the victor had left among that conquered people, whose obstinate attachment to idolatry no arguments nor exhortations could overcome. More forcible means were afterwards used.

[g] HUCBAIDI *Vita S. LEEUINI* in LAUR. SURII *Vitis Sanctior*. d. 12. Nov. p. 277. JO. MOLLEII *Cimbria Litterata*, tom. ii. p. 464.

to draw them into the pale of the church, in the wars which CHARLEMAGNE carried on, in the years 775, 776, and 780, against that valiant people, whose love of liberty was excessive, and whose aversion to the restraints of sacerdotal authority was inexpressible [b]. During these wars, their attachment to the superstition of their ancestors was so warmly combated by the allurements of reward, by the terror of punishment, and by the imperious language of victory, that they suffered themselves to be baptised, though with inward reluctance, by the missionaries, which the emperor sent among them for that purpose [i]. These fed-

[b] It will be proper here to transcribe, from the epistles of the famous ALCUIN, once abbot of *Canterbury*, a remarkable passage, which will shew us the reasons which contributed principally to give the Saxons an aversion to Christianity, and at the same time expose the absurd and preposterous manner of teaching used by the missionaries, who were sent to convert them. This passage, in the civth *epistle*, and the 1647th page of his works, is as follows: "Si tanta instantia leve CHRISTI jugum et onus ejus leve durissimo Saxonum populo prædicaretur, quanta Decimarum reddiri vel legalis pro parvissimis quibuscunque culpis edictis necessitas exigebatur, forte baptismatis sacramenta non abhorrerent. Sine tandem aliquando DOCTORIS FIDEI APOSTOLICIS FRUITI EXEMPLIS: SINT PRÆDICATORES NON PRÆDicatores." Here the reader may see a lively picture of the kind of apostles that flourished at this time; apostles who were more zealous in exacting *tithes*, and extending their authority, than in propagating the sublime truths and precepts of the gospel. And yet these very apostles are said to have wrought stupendous miracles.

[i] ALCUINUS apud WILHELMUM MALMESBUR. *De gestis regum Anglorum*, lib. i. cap. iv. p. 23. inter *Rerum Anglicarum Scriptores*, Francofurti, A. D. 1601. editos. In this work we find the following passage, which proves what we have said with respect to the unworthy methods that were used in converting the Saxons: "Antiqui Saxones et omnes Bretonum populi, instante Rege CAROLO, alios PRÆMIIS et alios MINIS sollicitantes ad fidem CHRISTI conversi sunt." See also two passages in the *Capitularia Regum Francor.* tom. i. p. 246. and 252. From the first of these passages we learn, that those of the Saxons who abandoned the Pagan superstitions,

CENT.
VIII.
PART I.

seditions, indeed, were soon after renewed, and fomented by WIDEKIND and ALBION, two of the most valiant among the Saxon chiefs, who attempted to abolish the Christian worship by the same violent methods which had contributed to its establishment. But the courage and liberality of CHARLEMAGNE, alternately employed to suppress this new rebellion, engaged these chiefs to make a public and solemn profession of Christianity in the year 785, and to promise an adherence to that divine religion for the rest of their days [k]. To prevent, however, the Saxons from renouncing a religion which they had embraced with reluctance, several bishops were appointed to reside among them, schools also were erected, and monasteries founded, that the means of instruction might not be wanting. The same precautions were employed among the Huns in *Pannonia*, to maintain in the profession of Christianity that fierce people, whom CHARLEMAGNE had convert-

tions, were "restored to the liberty they had forfeited by the fate of arms, and freed from the obligation of paying tribute;" and in the second, we find the following severe law, that "every Saxon, who contemptuously refused to receive the sacrament of baptism, and persisted in his adherence to Paganism, was to be punished with death." While such rewards and punishments were employed in the cause of religion, there was no occasion for miracles to advance its progress, for these motives were sufficient to draw all mankind to an hypocritical and external profession of the gospel; but it is easy to imagine what sort of Christians the Saxons must have been, who were dragooned into the church in this abominable manner. Compare with the authors mentioned in this note, LAUNOIS, *De veteri more baptizandi Judeos et Infideles*, cap. v, vi. p. 703. tom. ii. opp. part II. This author assures us that ADRIAN, the first Roman pontif of that name, honoured with his approbation CHARLEMAGNE's method of converting the Saxons.

[k] EGINARTUS, *De vita Caroli M.* ADAM BREMENSIS, lib. i. cap. viii. See also the writers of the history and exploits of CHARLEMAGNE, which are mentioned by JO. ALB. FABRICIUS, in his *Bibliotheca Latina medii ævi*, tom. i. p. 950.

ed to the faith, when, exhausted and dejected by various defeats, they were no longer able to make head against his victorious arms, and chose rather to be Christians than *slaves* [1].

CENT.
VIII.
PART I.

VII. Succeeding generations, filled with a grateful sense of the famous exploits which CHARLEMAGNE had performed in the service of Christianity, canonized his memory, and turned this bloody warrior into an eminent *saint*. In the twelfth century FREDERIC I. emperor of the Romans, ordered PASCHAL II. whom he had raised to the pontificate, to enrol the name of this mighty conqueror among the tutelary saints of the church [m]. And indeed CHARLEMAGNE merited this honour, according to the opinions which prevailed at that period of time; for to have enriched the clergy with large and magnificent donations [n], and to have extended the boundaries of the church, no matter by what methods, was then considered as the highest merit, and as a sufficient pretension to the honour of *sainthood*. But in the esteem of those, who judge of the nature and characters of *sainthood* by the decisions of the gospel upon that head, the *sainted* emperor will appear utterly unworthy of that ghostly dignity. For, not to enter into a particular detail of his vices, whose number counterbalanced that of his virtues, it is undeniably evident, that his ardent and ill-conducted zeal for the conversion of the Huns, Frieslanders, and Saxons, was more animated by the suggestions of ambition, than by a principle

The judgment we ought to form of the conversions made by Charlemagne :

[1] *Vita S. Rudberti* in HENRIC. CONISII *Lectionibus antiquis*, tom. iii. part II. p. 340. PAULI DEBREGENI *Historia Ecclesiæ Reformat. in Hungar. et Transilvania* a LAMPPIO edita, pars I. cap. ii. p. 10.

[m] Vid. HENR. CANISII *Lectiones Antiquæ*, tom. iii. pars II. p. 207. WALCHII *Dissert. de Caroli Magni Canonizatione*.

[n] Vid. *Caroli Testamentum* in STEPH. BALUSII *Capitularibus Regum Francor.* tom. i. p. 487.

CENT.
VIII.
PART I.

of true piety; and that his main view in these religious exploits was to subdue the converted nations under his dominion, and to tame them to his yoke, which they supported with impatience, and shook off by frequent revolts. It is, moreover, well known, that this boasted saint made no scruple of seeking the alliance of the infidel Saracens, that he might be more effectually enabled to crush the Greeks, notwithstanding their profession of the Christian religion [o].

And of the miracles which are said to have been performed in this century.

VIII. The many and stupendous miracles, which are said to have been wrought by the Christian missionaries, who were sent to convert the barbarous nations, have lost, in our times, the credit they obtained in former ages. The corrupt discipline that then prevailed, admitted of those fallacious stratagems, which are very improperly called *pious* frauds; nor did the heralds of the gospel think it at all unlawful to terrify or allure to the profession of Christianity by fictitious prodigies, those obdurate hearts, which they could not subdue by reason and argument. It is not, however, to be supposed, that all those, who acquired renown by their miracles, were chargeable with this fanatical species of artifice and fraud. For as, on the one hand, those ignorant and superstitious nations were disposed to look upon, as miraculous, every event which had an unusual aspect; so, on the other, the Christian doctors themselves were so uninstructed and superficial, so little acquainted with the powers of nature, and the relations and connections of things in their ordinary course, that uncommon events, however natural, were considered by them as miraculous interpositions of the Most High. This will appear obvious to such as, void of superstition and

[o] See BASNAGE, *Histoire des Juifs*, tom. ix. cap. ii. p. 40.

partiality, read the *Acts of the saints* who flourished in this and the following centuries.

CENT.
VIII.
PART I.

C H A P. II.

Concerning the calamitous events that happened to the church during this century.

I. **T**HE eastern empire had now fallen from its former strength and grandeur, through the repeated shocks of dreadful revolutions, and the consuming power of intestine calamities. The throne was now become the seat of terror, inquietude and suspicion; nor was any reign attended with an uninterrupted tranquillity. In this century three emperors were dethroned, loaded with ignominy, and sent into banishment. Under LEO the Isaurian, and his son CONSTANTINE, surnamed COPRONYMUS, arose that fatal controversy about the worship of images, which proved a source of innumerable calamities and troubles, and weakened, almost incredibly, the force of the empire. These troubles and dissensions left the Saracens at liberty to ravage the provinces of *Asia* and *Africa*, to oppress the Greeks in the most barbarous manner, and to extend their territories and dominion on all sides, as also to oppose every where the progress of Christianity, and, in some places, to extirpate it entirely. But the troubles of the empire, and the calamities of the church, did not end here: for about the middle of this century, they were assailed by new enemies, still more fierce and inhuman than those whose usurpations they had hitherto suffered. These were the Turks, a tribe of the Tartars, or at least their descendants, who, breaking forth from the inaccessible wilds about mount *Caucasus*, overspread *Colchis*, *Iberia*, and *Albania*, rushed from thence into *Armenia*,

The Saracens become masters in the east.

The incursion of the Turks.

CENT.
VIII.
PART I.

Their pro-
gress in the
west.

menia, and, after having subdued the Saracens, turned their victorious arms against the Greeks, whom, in process of time, they reduced under their dominion.

II. In the year 714, the Saracens crossed the sea, which separates *Spain* from *Africa*, dispersed the army of RODERIC king of the Spanish Goths [*p*], whose defeat was principally due to the treachery of their general JULIAN, and made themselves masters of the greatest part of the territories of this vanquished prince. About the same time the empire of the Visigoths, which had subsisted in *Spain* above three hundred years, was totally overturned by these fierce and savage invaders, who also took possession of all the maritime coasts of *Gaul*, from the Pyrenean mountains to the river *Rhone*, from whence they made frequent excursions, and ravaged the neighbouring countries with fire and sword.

The rapid progress of these bold invaders was, indeed, checked by CHARLES MARTELL, who gained a signal victory over them in a bloody action near the city of *Poitiers*, A. D. 732 [*q*]. But the vanquished spoilers soon recovered their strength and their ferocity, and returned with new violence to their devastations. This engaged CHARLEMAGNE to lead a formidable army into *Spain*, with a design to deliver that whole country from the oppressive yoke of the Saracens: but this grand enterprize, though it did not entirely miscarry, was not, however, attended with the signal success that was expected from it [*r*].

[*p*] JO. MARIANA, *Rerum Hispanicarum*, lib. vi. cap. xxi. EUSEBE RENAUDOT *Historia Patriarch. Alexandrin.* p. 253. JO. DE FERRERAS, *Hist. d'Espagne*, tom. ii. p. 425.

[*q*] PAULUS DIACONUS, *De gestis Longobard.* lib. vi. cap. xlv. liii. JO. MARIANA, *Rerum Hispan.* lib. vii. cap. iii. BAYLE's *Dictionary*, at the article ABDERAMUS. FERRERAS, *Hist. d'Espagne*, tom. ii. p. 463.

[*r*] HENR. DE BUNAU, *Teutsche Keyser-und Reich's Histoire*, tom. ii. p. 392. FERRERAS, *Hist. d'Espagne*, tom. ii. p. 506.

The

The inroads of this warlike people were felt by many of the western provinces, besides those of *France* and *Spain*. Several parts of *Italy* suffered from their incursions; the island of *Sardinia* was reduced under their yoke; and *Sicily* was ravaged and oppressed by them in the most inhuman manner. Hence the Christian religion in *Spain* and *Sardinia* suffered inexpressibly under these violent usurpers.

In *Germany*, and the adjacent countries, the Christians were assailed by another sort of enemies; for all such as adhered to the Pagan superstitions beheld them with the most inveterate hatred, and persecuted them with the most unrelenting violence and fury [s]. Hence, in several places, castles and fortresses were erected to restrain the incursions of these Barbarian zealots.

[s] SERVATI LUPI *vita Wigberti*, p. 304.

PART II

The INTERNAL HISTORY of the CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the state of letters and philosophy during this century.

C E N T. I.
V I I I.
P A R T I I.

The state of
learning
among the
Greeks.

THERE were not wanting among the Greeks men of genius and talents, who might have contributed to prevent the total decline of literature, but their zeal was damped by the tumults and desolations that reigned in the empire; and while both church and state were menaced with approaching ruin, the learned were left destitute of that protection which gives both vigour and success to the culture of the arts and sciences. Hence few or none of the Greeks were at all famous either for elegance of diction, true wit, copious erudition, or a zealous attachment to the study of philosophy, and the investigation of truth. Frigid homilies, insipid narrations of the exploits of pretended saints, vain and subtle disputes about unessential and trivial subjects, vehement and bombastic declamations for or against the erection and worship of images, histories composed without method or judgment; such were monuments of Grecian learning in this miserable age.

The progress of the
Aristotelian
philosophy.

II. It must, however, be observed, that the Aristotelian philosophy was taught every where in the public schools, and was propagated in all places with considerable success. The doctrine of PLATO had lost all its credit in the schools, after the repeated sentences of condemnation that had

had been passed upon the opinions of ORIGEN, and the troubles which the Nestorian and Eutychian controversies had excited in the church; so that Platonism now was almost confined to the solitary retreats of the monastic orders. Of all the writers in this century, who contributed to the illustration and progress of the Aristotelian philosophy, the most eminent was JOHN DAMASCENUS, who composed a concise, plain, and comprehensive view of the doctrines of the Stagirite, for the instruction of the more ignorant, and in a manner adapted to common capacities. This little work excited numbers, both in *Greece* and *Syria*, to the study of that philosophy, whose proselytes increased daily. The Nestorians and Jacobites were also extremely diligent in the study of ARISTOTLE's writings, from whence they armed themselves with sophisms and quibbles, which they employed against the Greeks in the controversy concerning the nature and person of CHRIST.

III. The literary history of the Latins exhibits innumerable instances of the grossest ignorance [a], which will not, however, appear surprising to such as consider, with attention, the state of *Europe* in this century. If we except some poor remains of learning, which were yet to be found at *Rome*, and in certain cities of *Italy* [b], the sciences seemed to have abandoned the continent, and fixed their residence in *Britain* and *Ireland* [c]. Those, therefore, of the Latin writers, who were distinguished by their learning and genius, were all (a few French and Italians ex-

The revival of learning among the Latins by Charlemagne.

[a] Vid. STEPH. BALUZ. *Observat. ad Reginonem Prumiensem*, p. 540.

[b] LUD. ANT. MURATORI *Antiq. Italicae medi ævi*, tom. iii. p. 811.

[c] JAC. USSERI JS, *Præf. ad Syllogem Epistolarum Hibernicarum*.

C E N T.
VIII.
PART II.

cepted) either British or Scotch, such as **ALCUIN**, **BEDE**, **EGBERT**, **CLEMENS**, **DUNGALLUS**, **ACCA**, and others. **CHARLEMAGNE**, whose political talents were embellished by a considerable degree of learning, and an ardent zeal for the culture of the sciences, endeavoured to dispel the profound ignorance that reigned in his dominions; in which excellent undertaking he was animated and directed by the counsels of **ALCUIN**. With this view he drew, first from *Italy*. and afterwards from *Britain* and *Ireland*, by his liberality, eminent men, who had distinguished themselves in the various branches of literature; and excited the several orders of the clergy and monks by various encouragements, and the nobility, and others of eminent rank, by his own example, to the pursuit of knowledge in all its branches, human and divine.

Cathedral
and monastic
schools
erected.

IV. In the prosecution of this noble design, the greatest part of the bishops erected, by the express order of the emperor, cathedral schools (so called from their lying contiguous to the principal church in each diocese), in which the youth, which were set apart for the service of **CHRIST**, received a learned and religious education. Those also of the abbots, who had any zeal for the cause of Christianity, opened schools in their monasteries, in which the more learned of the fraternity instructed such as were designed for the monastic state, or the sacerdotal order, in the Latin language, and other branches of learning suitable to their future destination. It was formerly believed, that the university of *Paris* was erected by **CHARLEMAGNE**; but this opinion is rejected by such as have studied, with impartiality, the history of this age; though it is undeniably evident, that this great prince had the honour of laying, in some measure, the foundation of that noble institution, and that the beginnings from which it arose

arose were owing entirely to him [d]. However this question be decided, it is undeniably certain, that the zeal of this emperor, for the propagation and advancement of letters, was very great, and manifested its ardor by a considerable number of excellent establishments; nor among others must we pass with silence the famous *Palatine* school, which he erected with a view to banish ignorance from his court; and in which the princes of the blood, and the children of the nobility, were educated by the most learned and illustrious masters of the times [e].

CENT.
VIII
PART II.

V. These excellent establishments were not, however, attended with the desired success; nor was the improvement of the youth, in learning and virtue, at all proportioned to the pains that were taken, and the bounty that was bestowed to procure them a liberal education. This, indeed, will not appear surprising, when we consider that the most learned and renowned masters of these times were men of very little genius and abilities, and that their system of erudition and philosophy was nothing more than a lean and ghastly skeleton equally unfit for ornament and use. The whole circle of the sciences was composed of, what they called, the seven liberal arts, viz. grammar, rhetoric, logic, arithmetic, geometry, music, and astronomy [f]; the three former of which they distinguished by the title of

But not attended with the desired success.

[d] The reasons that have been used, to prove CHARLEMAGNE the founder of the university of *Paris*, are accurately collected in DU BOULAY, *Historia Academicæ Parisi.* tom. i. p. 91. But they have been refuted by the following learned men in a victorious manner, viz. MABILLON, *Act. Sanct. Ord. Benedict.* tom. v. *Præf.* § 181, 182. LAUNOY, CLAUDE JOLY, *De scholis.*

[e] DU BOULAY, *Histor. Academ. Parisi.* tom. i. p. 281. MABILLON, l. c. § 179.

[f] HERM. CONRINGII *Antiquitat. Academicæ Diff.* iii. p. 80. JAC. THOMASII *Programmata*, p. 368. *Observation. Halensium*, tom. vi. *Observ.* xiv. p. 118.

trivium,

C E N T.
VIII.
P A R T II.

trivium, and the four latter by that of *quadrivium*. Nothing can be conceived more wretchedly barbarous than the manner in which these sciences were taught, as we may easily perceive from ALCUIN's treatise concerning them [g]; and the dissertations of St. AUGUSTIN on the same subject, which were in the highest repute at this time. In the greatest part of the schools, the public teachers ventured no further than the *trivium*, and confined their instructions to grammar, rhetoric, and logic: they, however, who, after passing the *trivium* and also the *quadrivium*, were desirous of rising yet higher in their literary pursuits, were exhorted to apply themselves to the study of CASSIODORE and BOETHIUS, as if the progress of human knowledge was bounded by the discoveries of those two learned writers.

C H A P. II.

Concerning the doctors and ministers of the church, and its form of government during this century.

The vices of
the clergy.

I. **T**HAT corruption of manners, which dishonoured the clergy in the former century, increased, instead of diminishing, in this, and discovered itself under the most odious characters, both in the eastern and western provinces. In the east there arose the most violent dissensions and quarrels among the bishops and doctors of the church, who, forgetting the duties of their stations, and the cause of CHRIST in which they were engaged, threw the state into

[g] ALCUINI *Opera*, part II. p. 1245. edit. Quercetani. It is, however, to be observed, that the treatise of ALCUIN, here referred to, is not only imperfect, but is almost entirely transcribed from CASSIODORE.

combustion by their outward clamours, and their scandalous divisions; and even went so far as to embrue their hands in the blood of their brethren who differed from them in opinion. In the western world, Christianity was not less disgraced by the lives and actions of those who pretended to be the luminaries of the church, and who ought to have been so in reality, by exhibiting examples of piety and virtue to their flock. The clergy abandoned themselves to their passions without moderation or restraint: they were distinguished by their luxury, their gluttony, and their lust; they gave themselves up to dissipations of various kinds, to the pleasures of hunting, and, what was still more remote from their sacred character, to military studies [b] and enterprizes. They had also so far extinguished every principle of fear and shame, that they became incorrigible; nor could the various laws enacted against their vices by CARLOMAN, PEPIN, and CHARLEMAGNE, at all contribute to set bounds to their licentiousness, or to bring about their reformation [1].

II. It is, indeed, amazing, that, notwithstanding the shocking nature of such vices, especially in a set of men whose profession obliged them to display to the world the attracting lustre of virtuous example; and notwithstanding the perpetual troubles and complaints which these vices occasioned; the clergy were still held, corrupt as they were, in the highest veneration, and were honoured, as a sort of deities, by the submissive multitude. This veneration for the bishops and clergy, and the influence and authority it gave them over the people, were, indeed, carried much higher in the west than in the eastern pro-

The veneration in which the clergy were held in the west.

[b] STEPH BALUZIUS *ad Reginon. Prumiensem*, p. 563. WILKINS, *Comitia Magnæ Britannicæ*, tom. 1. p. 90.

[1] STEPH. BALUZ. *Capitular. regum Francor.* tom. i. p. 189. 208. 275. 493, &c.

vinces;

CENT.
VIII.
PART II.

inces; and the reasons of this difference will appear manifest to such as consider the customs and manners that prevailed among the barbarous nations, which were, at this time, masters of *Europe*, before their conversion to Christianity. All these nations, during their continuance under the darkness of paganism, were absolutely enslaved to their priests, without whose counsel and authority they transacted nothing of the least importance either in civil or military affairs [k]. Upon their conversion to Christianity, they, therefore, thought proper to transfer to the ministers of their new religion, the rights and privileges of their

[k] JULIUS CÆSAR, *De bello Gallico*, lib. v. cap. 13. "Druides magno sunt apud eos honore: nam fere de omnibus controversiis, publicis privatisque, constituunt; et, si quod est admissum facinus, si cædes facta, si de hereditate, si de finibus controversia est, iidem decernunt, præmia, pœnasque constituunt: si qui aut publicus eorum decreto non stetit, sacrificiis interdicunt—Druides a bello abesse consueverunt, neque tributa una cum reliquis pendunt: militiæ vacationem, omniumque rerum habent immunitatem. Tantis excitati præmiis, et sua sponte multi in disciplinam conveniunt, et a parentibus propinquisque mittuntur." TACITUS (*De mor. Germanorum*, cap. 7. p. 384. edit. Gronov.) expresses also the power and authority of the priests or Druids in the following terms: "Neque enim animadvertere, neque vincere, neque verberare quidem, nisi sacerdotibus permisum, non quasi in pœnam, nec ducis jussu, sed velut Deo impetrante." And again, cap. ii. "Silentium per sacerdotes, quibus et tum coercendi jus est, imperatur." HELMOLDUS, *Chron. Sclavorum*, lib. i. cap. xxxvi. p. 90. expresses himself to the same purpose, "Major Flaminiis, quam Regis, apud ipsos veneratio est." And again, lib. ii. cap. xii. p. 235. "Rex apud eos modicæ æstimationis est comparatione Flaminiis. Ille enim responsa perquirat—Rex et populus ad illius nutum pendunt." This ancient custom of honouring their priests, and submitting, in all things, to their decisions, was still preserved by the Germans, and the other European nations, after their conversion to Christianity: and this furnishes a satisfactory answer to that question, *viz.* How it came to pass that the Christian priesthood obtained in the west that enormous degree of authority, which is so contrary to the positive precepts of CHRIST, and the nature and genius of his divine religion.

former

former priests : and the Christian bishops, in their turn, were not only ready to accept the offer, but used all their diligence and dexterity to secure and assert to themselves and their successors, the dominion and authority which the ministers of paganism had usurped over an ignorant and brutish people.

CENT.
VIII.
PART II.

III. The honours and privileges, which the western nations had voluntarily conferred upon the bishops, and other doctors of the church; were now augmented with new and immense accessions of opulence and authority. The endowments of the church and monasteries, and the revenues of the bishops, were hitherto considerable; but in this century a new and ingenious method was found out of acquiring much greater riches to the church, and of increasing its wealth through succeeding ages. An opinion prevailed universally at this time, though its authors are not known, that the punishment which the righteous judge of the world has reserved for the transgressions of the wicked, was to be prevented and annulled, by liberal donations to God, to the saints, to the churches and clergy. In consequence of this notion, the great and opulent, who were, generally speaking, the most remarkable for their flagitious and abominable lives, offered, out of the abundance which they had received by inheritance, or acquired by rapine, rich donations to departed saints, their ministers upon earth, and the keepers of the temples that were erected in their honour, in order to avoid the sufferings and penalties annexed by the priests to transgression in this life [1], and to escape the misery denounced

Their riches
increased,
and their
privileges
multiplied.

[1] The temporal penalties here mentioned were rigorous fasts, bodily pains and mortifications, long and frequent prayers, pilgrimages to the tombs of saints and martyrs, and such like austerities. These were the penalties which the priests

CENT.
VIII.
PART II.

They are
invested
with prin-
cipalities
and royal
domains.

ced against the wicked in a future state. This new and commodious method of making atonement for iniquity, was the principal source of those immense treasures, which, from this period, began to flow in upon the clergy, the churches, and monasteries, and continued to enrich them through succeeding ages down to the present time [m].

IV. But here it is highly worthy of observation, that the donations which princes and persons of the first rank presented, in order to make expiation for their sins, and to satisfy the justice of God, and the demands of the clergy, did not only consist in those *private* possessions, which every citizen may enjoy, and with which the churches and convents were already abundantly enriched; no: these donations were carried to a much more extravagant length, and the church was endowed with several of those *public* grants, which are peculiar to princes and sovereign states, and which are commonly called *regalia*, or royal domains. Emperors, kings, and princes, signalized their superstitious veneration for the clergy, by investing bishops, churches, and monasteries, in the possession of whole provinces, cities, castles, and fortresses, with all the rights and prerogatives of sovereignty that were annexed to them under the dominion of their former masters. Hence it

priests imposed upon such as had confessed their crimes: and as they were singularly grievous to those who had led voluptuous lives, and were desirous of continuing in the same course of licentious pleasure, effeminacy, and ease; the richer sort of transgressors embraced eagerly this new method of expiation, and willingly gave a part of their substance to avoid such severe and rigorous penalties.

[m] Hence, by a known form of speech, they who offered donations to the church or clergy were said to do this for the redemption of their soul; and the gifts themselves were generally called the price of transgression. See LUD. ANT. MURATORI *Diff. de Redemptione Peccatorum*, in his *Antiquitates Italicae mediæ ævi*, tom. v. p. 712.

came to pafs that they, who, by their holy profeffion, were appointed to proclaim to the world the vanity of human grandeur, and to infpire into the minds of men, by their instructions and their example, a noble contempt of sublunary things, became themfelves scandalous fpectacles of worldly pomp, ambition, and fplendour; were created *dukes, counts, and marquifes*, judges, legiflators, and fovereigns; and not only gave laws to nations, but alfo, upon many occafions, gave battle to their enemies at the head of numerous armies of their own raifing. It is here that we are to look for the fource of thofe dreadful tumults and calamities that fpread defolation through *Europe* in after-times, particularly of thofe bloody wars concerning *investitures*, and thofe obftinate contentions and difputes about the *regalia*.

C E N T.
VIII.
P A R T II.

V. The exceffive donations that were made to the clergy, and that extravagant liberality that augmented daily the treafures of the European churches (to which thefe donations and this liberality were totally confined) began in this century; nor do we find any examples of the like munificence in preceding times. From hence we may conclude that thefe donations were owing to customs peculiar to the European nations, and to the maxims of policy* that were eftablifhed among thofe warlike people. The kings of thefe nations, who were employed either in ufurpation or felf-defence, endeavoured, by all means, to attach warmly to their interefts thofe whom they confidered as their friends and clients; and, for this purpofe, they diftributed among them extenfive territories, cities, and fortrefles, with the various rights and privileges belonging to them, referving to themfelves no more than the fupreme dominion, and alfo the military fervice of their powerful vaffals. This then being the method of

The caufes
of this ex-
ceffive libe-
rality to the
clergy.

CENT.
VIII.
PART II.

governing customary in *Europe*, it was esteemed by princes a high instance of political prudence to distribute among the bishops, and other Christian doctors, the same sort of donations that they had formerly made to their generals and clients; for it is not to be believed, that superstition alone was always the principle that drew forth their liberality. They expected more fidelity and loyalty from a set of men, who were bound by the obligations of religion, and consecrated to the service of God, than from a body of nobility, composed of fierce and impetuous warriors, and accustomed to little else than bloodshed and rapine. And they hoped also to check the seditious and turbulent spirits of their vassals, and maintain them in their obedience, by the influence and authority of the bishops, whose commands were highly respected, and whose spiritual thunderbolts, rendered formidable by ignorance, struck terror into the boldest and most resolute hearts [n].

VI.

[n] The account here given of the rise of the clergy to such enormous degrees of opulence and authority, is corroborated by the following remarkable passage of WILLIAM OF MAIMSBURY (lib. v. *De rebus gestis regum Anglie*), “*Carolus Magnus, pro contundenda gentium illarum ferocia, omnes pene terras ecclesiis contulerat, consiliofissime perpendens, nolle sacri ordinis homines, tam facile quam Laicos, fidelitatem Dòmini rejicere: præterea si Laici rebellarent, illos posse excommunicationis auctoritate et potentia severitate compescere.*” This is, doubtless, the true reason why CHARLEMAGNE, who was far from being a superstitious prince, or a slave to the clergy, augmented so vastly the jurisdiction of the Roman pontif in Germany, Italy, and the other countries, where he had extended his conquests, and accumulated upon the bishops such ample possessions. He expected more loyalty and submission from the clergy than from the laity; and he augmented the riches and authority of the former, in order to secure his throne against the assaults of the latter. As the bishops were universally held in the highest veneration, he made use of their influence in checking the rebellious

VI. This prodigious accession to the opulence and authority of the clergy in the west began at their head, the Roman pontif, and spread gradually from thence among the inferior bishops, and also among the sacerdotal and monastic orders. The barbarous nations, who received the gospel, looked upon the bishop of *Rome* as the successor of their chief *druid*, or high priest. And as this tremendous druid had enjoyed, under the darknets of paganism, a boundless authority, and had been treated with a degree of veneration, that, through its servile excess, degenerated into terror; so the barbarous nations, upon their conversion to Christianity, thought proper to confer upon the chief of the bishops the same honours and the same authority that had formerly been vested in their *arch-druid* [o]. The Roman pon-

C E N T.
VIII.
PART II.

Particularly
to the Ro-
man pontif.

bellious spirit of his dukes, counts, and knights, who were frequently very troublesome. *CHARLEMAGNE*, for instance, had much to fear from the dukes of *Benevento*, *Spoletto*, and *Capua*, when the government of the Lombards was overturned: he therefore made over a considerable part of *Italy* to the *Roman* pontif, whose ghostly authority, opulence, and threatnings were so proper to restrain those powerful and vindictive princes from seditious insurrections, or to quell such tumults as they might venture to excite. Nor was *CHARLEMAGNE* the only prince who honoured the clergy from such political views; the other kings and princes of *Europe* acted much in the same manner, and from the same principles, as will appear evident to all who consider, with attention, the forms of government, and the methods of governing, that took place in this century. So that the excessive augmentation of sacerdotal opulence and authority, which many look upon as the work of superstition alone, was, in many instances, an effect of political prudence. We shall consider, presently, the terrors of *excommunication*, which *WILLIAM* of *MALMESBURY* touches but cursorily in the latter words of the passage above quoted.

[o] *CÆSAR* speaks thus of the chief or arch-druid: "His omnibus druidibus præst unus, qui summam inter eos (Celtas) habet auctoritatem. Hoc mortuo, si qui ex reliquis excellit dignitate, succedit. At si sunt plures pares, suffragio Druidum adlegitur: nonnunquam etiam armis de principatu contendunt." Vide *JUL. CÆSAR, De bello Gallico*, lib. vi. cap. xiii.

CENT.
VIII.
PART II.

tif received, with something more than a mere ghottly delight, these august privileges; and lest, upon any change of affairs, attempts might be made to deprive him of them, he strengthened his title to these extraordinary honours, by a variety of passages drawn from ancient history, and, what was still more astonishing, by arguments of a religious nature. This conduct of a superstitious people swelled the arrogance of the Roman druid to an enormous size; and gave to the see of *Rome* that high pre-eminence, and that despotic authority, in civil and political matters, that were unknown to former ages. Hence, among other unhappy circumstances, arose that most monstrous and most pernicious opinion, that such persons as were excluded from the communion of the church by the pontif himself, or any of the bishops, forfeited thereby not only their civil rights and advantages as citizens, but even the common claims and privileges of humanity. This horrid opinion, which was a fatal source of wars, massacres, and rebellions without number, and which contributed more than any thing else to augment and confirm the papal authority, was, unhappily for *Europe*, borrowed by Christians, or rather by the clergy, from the Pagan superstitions [*p*].

VII.

[*p*] Though *excommunication*, from the time of *CONSTANTINE* the Great, was, in every part of the Christian world, attended with many disagreeable effects, yet its highest terrors were confined to *Europe*, where its aspect was truly formidable and hideous. It acquired also, in the eighth century, new accessions of terror; so that, from that period, the *excommunication* practised in *Europe* differed entirely from that which was in use in other parts of *Christendom*. Excommunicated persons were indeed considered, in all places, as objects of aversion both to God and men: but they were not, on this account, robbed of the privileges of citizens, nor of the rights of humanity; much less were those kings and princes, whom an insolent bishop had thought proper to exclude from the communion of the church, supposed to forfeit, on that account, their crowns or their territories. But, from this century,

VII. We see in the annals of the French nation the following remarkable and shocking instance of the enormous power that was, at this time, vested in the Roman pontif. PEPIN, who was *mayor of the palace* to CHILDERIC III, and who, in the exercise of that high office, was possessed, in reality, of the royal power and authority, not contented with this, aspired to the titles and honours of majesty, and formed the design of dethroning his sovereign. For this purpose, the states of the realm were assembled by PEPIN, A. D. 751; and though they were devoted to the interests of this ambitious usurper, they gave it as their opinion, that the bishop of Rome was previously to be consulted, whether the execution

CENT.
VIII.
PART II.

The Roman pontif obtains an addition to his authority, by favouring the ambition of Pepin.

tury, it was quite otherwise in Europe; excommunication received that infernal power which dissolved all connexions; so that those whom the bishops, or their chief, excluded from church communion, were degraded to a level with the beasts. Under this horrid sentence, the king, the ruler, the husband, the father, nay, even the *man*, forfeited all their rights, all their advantages, the claims of nature, and the privileges of society. What then was the origin of this unnatural power which excommunication acquired? It was briefly as follows: Upon the conversion of the barbarous nations to Christianity, these new and ignorant proselytes confounded the *excommunication* in use among Christians, with *that* which had been practised in the times of paganism by the priests of the gods, and considered them as of the same nature and effect. The Roman pontiffs, on the other hand, were too artful not to countenance and encourage this error; and, therefore, employed all sorts of means to gain credit to an opinion so proper to gratify their ambition, and to aggrandize, in general, the episcopal order. That this is the true origin of the extensive and horrid influence of the European and Papal excommunication, will appear evident to such as cast an eye upon the following passage of CÆSAR, *De bello Gallico*, lib. vi. cap. xiii. “Si qui aut privatus aut publicus Druidum decreto non stetit, sacrificiis interdicunt. Hæc poena est apud eos gravissima. Quibus ita est interdictum, ii numero impiorum et sceleratorum habentur, iis omnes decedunt, aditum eorum sermonemque defugiunt, ne quid ex consuetudine incommodi accipiant: neque iis potentibus jus redditur, neque honos ullus communicatur.”

CENT.
VIII.
PART II.

of such a project was lawful or not. In consequence of this, ambassadors were sent by PEPIN to ZACHARY, the reigning pontif, with the following question: *Whether the divine law did not permit a valiant and warlike people to dethrone a pusillanimous and indolent monarch, who was incapable of discharging any of the functions of royalty, and to substitute in his place one more worthy to rule, and who had already rendered most important services to the state?* The situation of ZACHARY, who stood much in need of the succours of PEPIN against the Greeks and Lombards, rendered his answer such as the usurper desired. And when this favourable decision of the Roman oracle was published in France, the unhappy CHILDERIC was stripped of royalty without the least opposition; and PEPIN, without the smallest resistance from any quarter, stepped into the throne of his master and his sovereign. Let the abettors of the papal authority see, how they can justify in CHRIST's pretended vicegerent upon earth, a decision, which is so glaringly repugnant to the laws and precepts of the divine Saviour [q]. This decision was solemnly confirmed by STEPHEN II., the successor

[q] See LE COINTÉ *Annal. Franciæ Ecclesiæ*. MEZERAY, DANIEL, and the other Gallic and German historians, concerning this important event; but particularly BOSSUET *Defens. declarationis Cleri Gallicani*, pars I. p. 225. PETR. RIVAL. *Dissertationes Histor. et Criticæ sur divers sujets*, Diss. ii. p. 70. Diss. iii. p. 156. Lond. 1726, in 8vo. HENR. DE BUNAU, *Historia Imperii Germanici*, tom. ii. p. 288. This remarkable event is not, indeed, related in the same manner by all historians, and it is generally represented under the falsest colours by those, who, from a spirit of blind zeal and excessive adulation, seize every occasion of exalting the dignity and authority of the bishops of Rome. Such writers assert, that it was by ZACHARY's authority as pontif, and not in consequence of his opinion as a casuist or divine, that the crown was taken from the head of CHILDERIC, and placed upon that of PEPIN. But this the French absolutely and justly deny. Had it, however, been so, the crime of the pontif would have been much greater than it was in reality.

of

of ZACHARY, who undertook a journey into *France*, in the year 754, in order to solicit assistance against the Lombards; and who, at the same time, dissolved the obligation of the oath of fidelity and allegiance which PEPIN had sworn to CHILDERIC, and violated by his usurpation, in the year 751. And to render his title to the crown as sacred as possible, STEPHEN anointed and crowned him, with his wife and two sons, for the second time [r].

VIII. This compliance of the Roman pontiffs proved an abundant source of opulence and credit to the church, and to its aspiring ministers. When that part of *Italy*, which was as yet subject to the Grecian empire, was involved in confusion and trouble, by the seditions and tumults which arose from the imperial edicts [s] against the erection and worship of images; the kings of the Lombards employed the united influence of their arms and negotiations in order to terminate these

The advantages derived to the see of Rome from the attachments of its bishops to the kings of France.

✠ [r] PEPIN had been anointed, by the legate BONIFACE at *Soissons*, soon after his election; but thinking that ceremony performed by the pope, would recommend him more to the respect of his subjects, he desired that it should be performed anew by STEPHEN. PEPIN is the first French monarch who received this unction as a ceremony of coronation, at least according to the reports of the most credible historians. His predecessors were proclaimed by being lifted up on a shield, and the *holy phial* of CLOVIS is now universally regarded as fabulous. The custom of anointing kings at their coronation was, however, more ancient than the time of PEPIN, and was observed long before that period both in *Scotland* and *Spain*. See EDMUND MARTENE, *De Antiq. Eccles. Ritib.* tom. iii. cap. x. As also BUNAU, *Historia Imperii Germanici*, tom. ii. p. 301. 366.

✠ [s] The author has here in view the edicts of LEO ISAURICUS and CONSTANTINE COPRONYMUS. The former published in the year 726, a famous edict against the worship of images, which occasioned many contests and much disturbance both in church and state; and the latter assembled at *Constantinople*, in the year 754, a council of 338 bishops, who unanimously condemned not only the worship, but also, the use, of images.

Q

contests.

C E N T.
VIII.
PART II.

The dona-
tion of Pe-
pin to that
see.

contests. Their success, indeed, was only advantageous to themselves; for they managed matters so as to become, by degrees, masters of the Grecian provinces in *Italy*, which were subject to the Exarch, who resided at *Ravenna*. Nay, one of these monarchs, named AISTULPHUS, carried his views still further. Elated with these new accessions to his dominions, he meditated the conquest of *Rome* and its territory, and formed the ambitious project of reducing all *Italy* under the yoke of the Lombards. The terrified pontif, STEPHEN II., addresses himself to his powerful patron and protector PEPIN, represents to him his deplorable condition, and implores his assistance. The French monarch embarks, with zeal, in the cause of the suppliant pontif; crosses the *Alps*, A. D. 754, with a numerous army; and having defeated AISTULPHUS, obliged him, by a solemn treaty, to deliver up to the see of *Rome* the exarchate of *Ravenna*, *Pentapolis*, and all the cities, castles, and territories, which he had seized in the Roman dukedom. It was not, however, long before the Lombard prince violated, without remorse, an engagement which he had entered into with reluctance. In the year 755 he laid siege to *Rome* for the second time, but was again obliged to sue for peace by the victorious arms of PEPIN, who returned into *Italy*, and forcing the Lombard to execute the treaty he had so audaciously violated, made a new grant of the exarchate [1], and
of

[1] See CAR. SIGONIUS, *De regno Italiæ*, lib. iii. p. 202. tom. ii. opp. BUNAU, *Historia Imperii Germanici*, tom. ii. p. 301. 366. MURATORI *Annali d'Italiæ*, tom. iv. p. 310. The real limits of the exarchate, granted by PEPIN to the Roman pontif, have been much controverted among the learned, and have, particularly in our times, employed the researches of several eminent writers. The bishops of *Rome* extend the limits of this exarchate as far as they can with any appearance of decency or probability; while their adversaries are as zealous

of *Pentapolis* to the Roman pontif and his successors in the apostolic see of St. PETER. And thus was the bishop of *Rome* raised to the rank of a temporal prince.

CEN T.
VIII.
PART II.

IX. After the death of PEPIN, a new attack was made upon the patrimony of St. PETER, by DIDEKIC king of the Lombards, who invaded the territories that had been granted by the *French* monarch to the see of *Rome*. In this extremity, ADRIAN I., who was pontif at that time, fled for succour to CHARLES, the son of PEPIN, who, on account of his heroic exploits, was afterwards distinguished by the name of CHARLEMAGNE. This prince, whose enterprising genius led him to seize with avidity every opportunity of extending

Charles-
magne's
grant to the
see of *Rome*.

ous in contracting this famous grant within narrower bounds. See LUD. ANT. MURATOR. *Droits de l'Empire sur l'Etat. Ecclesiastique*, cap. i, ii. As also his *Antiquitat. Ital. mediæ ævi*, tom. i. p. 64, 68. 986, 987. The same author treats the matter with more circumspection, tom. v. p. 790. This controversy can only be terminated with facility by an inspection of PEPIN's grant of the territory in question. FONTANINI, in his *First defence of the temporal jurisdiction of the see of Rome over the city of Commachio*, written in Italian, intimates, that this grant is still in being, and even makes use of some phrases that are contained in it (see the pages 242 and 346 of that work). This, however, will scarcely be believed. Were it, indeed, true that such a deed is yet in being, its being published to the world, would be, undoubtedly, unfavourable to the pretensions and interests of the church of *Rome*. It is at least certain, that in the recent dispute between the emperor JOSEPH and the Roman pontif concerning the city of *Commachio*, the partisans of the latter, though frequently called upon by those of the emperor to produce this grant, refused constantly to comply with this demand. On the other hand it must be confessed, that BLANCHINUS, in his *Prolegom. ad Anastasum de vitis pontif. Rom.* p. 55. has given us, from a Farnesian manuscript, a specimen of this grant, which seems to carry the marks of remote antiquity. Be that as it may, a multitude of witnesses unite in assuring us, that the remorse of a wounded conscience was the source of PEPIN's liberality, and that his grant to the Roman pontif was the superstitious remedy by which he hoped to expiate his enormities, and particularly his horrid perfidy to his master CHILDERIC.

his

CENT.
VIII.
PART II.

his conquests, and whose veneration for the Roman see was carried very far, as much from the dictates of policy as superstition, adopted immediately the cause of the trembling pontif. He passed the *Alps* with a formidable army A. D. 774, overturned the empire of the Lombards in *Italy*, which had subsisted above two hundred years, sent their exiled monarch into *France*, and proclaimed himself king of the Lombards. These conquests offered to CHARLEMAGNE an occasion of visiting *Rome*, where he not only confirmed the grants which had been made by his father to that see, but added to them new donations, and made to the Roman pontiffs a cession of several cities and provinces in *Italy*, which had not been contained in PEPIN's grant. What those cities and provinces were, is a question difficult to be resolved at this period of time, as it is perplexed with much obscurity, from the want of authentic records, by which alone it can be decided with certainty [*u*].

X. By

[*u*] See CAR. SIGONIUS, *De regno Italiae*, lib. iii. p. 223. tom. ii. opp. BUNAU, *Historia Imperii Germanici*, tom. ii. p. 363. PETR. de MARCA, *De concordia sacerdotii et imperii*, lib. i. cap. xii. p. 67. LUD. ANTON. MURATORI *Droits de l'Empire sur l'Etat Ecclesiastique*, cap. ii. p. 147. CONRINGIUS, *De Imperio Roman. German.* cap. vi. The extent of CHARLEMAGNE's grant to the see of *Rome* is as much disputed as that of PEPIN's, between the partisans of the pope, and those of the emperors. They who plead the cause of the Roman see, maintain that *Corfica*, *Sardinia*, *Sicily*, the territory of *Sabino*, the duchy of *Spoleto*, and several other places were solemnly granted, by CHARLEMAGNE, to ST. PETER and his successors. They, on the other hand, who assert the rights of the emperor, diminish as far as they can the munificence of CHARLES, and confine this new grant within narrow limits. The reader may consult upon this subject the authors of the present age, who have published their opinions concerning the pretensions of the emperors and the popes to the cities of *Commachio* and *Florence*, and the duchies of *Parma* and *Placentia*; but above all, the learned BERRER's excellent treatise, intitled,

X. By this act of liberality, which seems to carry in it the contradictory characters of policy and imprudence, CHARLEMAGNE opened for himself a passage to the empire of the west, and to the supreme dominion over the city of *Rome* and its territory, upon which the western empire seemed then to depend [*w*]. He had, no doubt,

C E N T.
VIII.
PART II.

The motives to which it is to be attributed.

titled, *Dissertatio Chorographica de Italia medii ævi*, f. 33. The spirit of party seems, in this controversy, as in many others, to have blinded the disputants on both sides of the question; and this, together with the difficulty of avoiding mistakes upon a point involved in such deep obscurity, has in many cases rendered the truth invisible to both the contending parties. With respect to the motives that induced CHARLEMAGNE to make this grant, they are much less doubtful than the extent of the grant itself. ADRIAN affirms, that the monarch's view was to *atone for his sins* by this act of liberality to the church, as we see in a letter from that pontiff to CHARLEMAGNE, which is published in MURATORI's *Scriptores rerum Italianar.* tom. iii. part II. p. 265: and of which the following passage is remarkable: "Venientes ad nos de Capua, "quam beato Petro apostolorum principi PROMERCTE ANI- "ME VESTRÆ atque sempiterna memoria cum ceteris civita- "tibus obtulistis." It is not indeed unlikely, that CHARLEMAGNE, who affected that kind of piety which was the characteristic of this barbarous age, mentioned this superstitious motive in the act of cession by which he confirmed his donation to the church; but such as are acquainted with the character of this prince, and the history of this period, will be cautious in attributing his generosity to this religious principle alone. His grand motive was, undoubtedly, of an ambitious kind; he was obstinately bent upon adding the western empire to his dominions, and the success of this grand project depended much upon the consent and assistance of the Roman pontiff, whose approbation, in those times, was sufficient to sanctify the most iniquitous projects; so that CHARLEMAGNE lavished gifts upon the bishops of *Rome*, that, by their assistance, he might assume, with a certain air of decency, the empire of the west, and confirm his new dominion in *Italy*. This policy we have taken notice of already, and it must appear manifest to all who view things with the smallest degree of impartiality and attention.

[*w*] CHARLES in reality was already emperor of the west, that is, the most powerful of the European monarchs. He wanted, therefore, nothing more than the title of emperor, and the supreme dominion in *Rome* and its territory, both of which he obtained by the assistance of LEO III.

been

CENT.
VIII.
PART II.

been meditating for a considerable time this arduous project, which his father PEPIN had probably formed before him, but the circumstances of the times obliged him to wait for a favourable occasion of putting it in execution. This was offered him in the year 800, when the affairs of the Greeks were reduced to the utmost extremity after the death of LEO III., and the barbarous murder of his son CONSTANTINE, and while the impious IRENE held the reins of empire. This favourable opportunity was seized with avidity by CHARLES, who set out for Rome, where he was received with the utmost demonstrations of zeal by the sovereign pontif [x], who had entered into his views, and persuaded the people, elated at this time with high notions of their independency and elective power, to unite their suffrages in favour of this prince, and to proclaim him emperor of the west [y].

The nature
and form of
the Roman
pontiff's
jurisdiction.

XI. CHARLES, upon his elevation to the empire of the west and the government of Rome, seems to have reserved to himself only the supreme dominion, and the unalienable rights of majesty, and to have granted to the church of Rome a subordinate jurisdiction over that great city, and its

[x] LEO III.

[y] See the historians who have transmitted to us accounts of this century, and more especially BUNAU, *Historia Imperii Romano German.* tom. ii. p. 537. The partisans of the Roman pontiffs generally maintain, that LEO III., by a divine right, vested in him as bishop of Rome, transported the western empire from the Greeks to the Franks, and conferred it upon CHARLEMAGNE, the monarch of the latter. From hence they conclude, that the Roman pontif, as the vicar of CHRIST, is the supreme lord of the whole earth, and, in a particular manner, of the Roman empire. The temerity of these pretensions, and the absurdity of this reasoning, are exposed with much learning and judgment by the celebrated FRED. SPANHEIM, *De fidei translatione imperii in Carolum M. per Leonem III.* tom. ii. opp. p. 557.

annexed

annexed territory [z]. This grant was undoubtedly suggested to him by the ambitious pontif as a matter of sacred and indispensable obligation, and many fictitious deeds were probably produced to make out the pretensions, and justify

CENT.
VIII.
PART II.

[z] That CHARLEMAGNE, in effect, preserved entire his supreme authority over the city of *Rome* and its adjacent territory, gave law to the citizens by judges of his own appointment, punished malefactors, enjoyed the prerogatives and exercised all the functions of royalty, has been demonstrated by several of the learned in the most ample and satisfactory manner, and confirmed by the most unexceptionable and authentic testimonies. To be convinced of this, it will be sufficient to consult MURATORI's *Droits de l'Empire sur l'Etat Ecclesiastique*, cap. vi. p. 77. And, indeed, they must have a strange power of resisting the clearest evidence, who are absurd enough to assert, as does FONTANINI, in his treatise, entitled, *Dominio della S. Sede sopra Comacchio*, Diss. i. c. 95, 96, that CHARLES sustained at *Rome* the character of the advocate of the Roman church, and not that of its sovereign or its lord, the dominion of the pontif being unlimited and universal. On the other hand, we must acknowledge ingenuously that the power of the pontif, both in the city of *Rome* and its annexed territory, was very great, and that, in several cases, he seemed to act with a princely authority. But the extent and the foundations of that authority are matters hid in the deepest obscurity, and have thereby given occasion to endless disputes. MURATORI maintains, in his work above cited, p. 102, that the bishop of *Rome* discharged the function of *exarch*, or *viscar*, to the emperor, an opinion which CLEMENT XI. rejected as injurious to the papal dignity, and which, indeed, does not appear to have any solid foundation. After a careful examination of all the circumstances that can contribute towards the solution of this perplexed question, the most probable account of the matter seems to be this: That the Roman pontif possessed the city of *Rome* and its territory by the same right that he held the exarchate of *Ravenna* and the other lands, of which he received the grant from CHARLEMAGNE; that is to say, that he possessed *Rome* as a feudal tenure, though charged with less marks of dependance than other fiefs generally are, on account of the lustre and dignity of a city which had been so long the capital of the empire. This opinion derives much strength from what we shall have occasion to observe in the following note, and it has the peculiar advantage of reconciling the jarring testimonies of ancient writers, and the various records of antiquity relating to this point.

the

CENT.
VIII.
PART II.

the claims of the church to this high degree of temporal authority and civil jurisdiction. In order to reconcile the new emperor to this grant, it was no doubt alleged, that CONSTANTINE the GREAT, his renowned predecessor, when he removed the seat of the empire to *Constantinople*, delivered up *Rome*, the old metropolis, with its adjacent territories, commonly called the Roman dukedom, to be possessed and governed by the Church, and that with no other restriction, than that this should be no detriment to his supreme dominion; and it was insinuated to CHARLES, that he could not depart from the rule established by that pious emperor, without incurring the wrath of God, and the indignation of St. PETER [a].

XII.

[a] Most writers are of opinion, that CONSTANTINE's pretended grant was posterior to this period, and was forged in the tenth century. It appears to me, on the contrary, that this fictitious grant was in being in the eighth century, and it is extremely probable that both ADRIAN and his successor LEO III. made use of it to persuade CHARLEMAGNE to that donation. In favour of this opinion, we have the unexceptionable testimony of ADRIAN himself in his letter to CHARLEMAGNE, which is published in MURATORI's *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, tom. iii. part II. p. 194. and which is extremely worthy of an attentive perusal. In this letter, ADRIAN exhorts CHARLES, before his elevation to the empire, to order the restitution of all the grants and donations that had formerly been made to St. PETER, and to the church of *Rome*. In this demand also he distinguishes, in the plainest manner, the donation of CONSTANTINE from those of the other princes and emperors, and, what is particularly remarkable, from the *exarchate* which was the gift of PEPIN, and even from the additions that CHARLES had already made to his father's grant; from whence we may justly conclude, that by the *donation* of CONSTANTINE, ADRIAN meant the city of *Rome* and its annexed territory. He speaks first of this grant in the following terms: "Deprecamur vestram Excellentiam . . . pro Dei amore
"et ipsius clavigeri regni cœlorum . . . ut secundum promissio-
"nem quam polliciti estis eidem Dei apostolo PRO ANIMÆ
"VSTRÆ MERCEDE et stabilitate regni vestri, omnia nostra
"temporibus adimplere jubeatis . . . et sicut temporibus beati
"SILVESTRE

The Grecian emperors check the ambition of the Roman pontiffs, and diminish their revenues.

XII. While the power and opulence of the Roman pontiffs were rising to the greatest height by the events which we have now been relating, they received a mortifying check in consequence of a quarrel which broke out between these haughty pontiffs and the Grecian emperors. LEO the Isaurian, and his son CONSTANTINE COPRONYMUS, incensed at the zeal which GREGORY II. and III. discovered for the worship of images, not only confiscated the treasures and lands which the

“SILVESTRI Romani pontificis, a sanctæ recordationis piissimo CONSTANTINO M. Imperatore, PLR EJUS largitatem (here CONSTANTINE's donation is evidently mentioned) sancta Dei catholica et apostolica Romana ecclesia elevata atque exaltata est, et POTESTATEM in his Hesperiarum partibus LARGIRI dignatus est: ita et in his vestris felicissimis temporibus atque nostris sancta Dei ecclesia germinet. . . et amplius atque amplius exaltata permanet. . . quia ecce novus Christianissimus Dei gratiâ CONSTANTINUS imperator (here we see CHARLES, who at that time was only a king, styled emperor by the pontif, and compared with CONSTANTINE) his temporibus surrexit, per quem omnia Deus sanctæ suæ ecclesiæ . . . largiri dignatus est.” So much for that part of the letter that relates to CONSTANTINE's grant: as to the other donations which the pontif evidently distinguishes from it, observe what follows: “SED ET CUNCTA ALIARUM per diversos Imperatores, Patricios, etiam et alios Deum viventes, PRO EORUM ANIMÆ MERCEDE ET VLVIA DELICTORUM, in partibus Tusciæ, Spoletio, seu Benevento, atque Corsica, simul et Pavinensi patrimonio, beato PETRO apostolo concessa sunt, et per nefandam gentem Longobardorum per annorum spatia abstracta et ablata sunt vestris temporibus, restituantur.” (The pontif intimates further, that all these grants were carefully preserved in the office of the Lateran, and that he sends them to CHARLES by his legates.) “Unde et plures donationes in facio nostro scrinio Lateranensi reconditas habemus, tamen et pro satisfactione Christianissimi regni vestri, per jam factos viros, ad demonstrandum eas vobis, direximus, et pro hoc petimus eximiam præcellentiam vestram, ut in integro ipsa patrimonia beato PETRO et nobis restituere jubeatis.” By this it appears that CONSTANTINE's grant was now in being among the archives of the Lateran, and was sent to CHARLEMAGNE with the other donations of kings and princes, whose examples were made use of to excite his liberality to the church.

church

C E N T. church of *Rome* possessed in *Sicily*, *Calabria*, and
 VIII. *Apulia*, but moreover withdrew the bishops of
 PART II. these countries, and also the various provinces and
 churches of *Illyricum*, from the jurisdiction of the
 Roman see, and subjected them to the spiritual
 dominion of the bishop of *Constantinople*. And so
 inflexibly were the Grecian emperors bent upon
 humbling the arrogance of the Roman pontifs,
 that no intreaties, supplications, nor threats could
 engage them to abandon their purpose, or to re-
 store this rich and signal portion of St. PETER's
 patrimony to his greedy successors [b]. It is here
 that we must look for the original source, and
 the principal cause of that vehement contest be-
 tween the Roman pontif and the bishop of *Con-*
stantinople, which, in the following century, di-
 vided the Greek and Latin churches, and was so
 pernicious to the interests and advancement of
 true Christianity. These lamentable divisions,
 which wanted no new incident to foment them,
 were, nevertheless, augmented by a controversy
 which arose, in this century, concerning the *de-*
riuation of the Holy Spirit, which we shall have oc-
 casion to mention more largely in its proper
 place. But it is more than probable that this
 controversy would have been terminated with the
 utmost facility, had not the spirits of the con-
 tending parties been previously exasperated by
 disputes founded upon avarice and ambition, and
 carried on, without either moderation or decency,
 by the *holy* patriarchs of *Rome* and *Constantinople*,
 in defence of their respective pretensions.

The mona-
 stic disci-
 pline fallen
 into decay.

XIII. The monastic discipline was extremely
 relaxed at this time both in the eastern and western
 provinces, and, as appears by the concurring

[b] See MICH. LEQUIEN's *Oriens Christianus*, tom. i. p. 96. Among the Greek writers also THEOPHANES and others acknowledge the fact; but they are not entirely agreed about the reasons to which it is to be attributed.

testimonies of the writers of this century, was fallen into a total decay. The only monks who escaped this general corruption, were they who passed their days in the deserts of *Egypt*, *Syria*, and *Mesopotamia*, amidst the austerities of a wretched life, and remote from all the comforts of human society: yet the merit of having preserved their discipline was sadly counterbalanced by the gross ignorance, the fanatical madness, and the sordid superstition that reigned among these miserable hermits. Those of the monastic orders who lived nearer cities and populous towns, troubled frequently the public tranquillity by the tumults and seditions they fomented among the multitude, so that it became necessary to check their rebellious ambition by the severe laws that were enacted against them by CONSTANTINE COPRONYMUS, and other emperors. The greatest part of the western monks followed, at this time, the rule of St. BENEDICT; though there were every where convents which adopted the discipline of other orders [c]. But as they increased in opulence they lost sight of all rules, and submitted, at length, to no other discipline than that of intemperance, voluptuousness, and sloth [d]. CHARLEMAGNE attempted, by various edicts, to put a stop to this growing evil; but his efforts were attended with little success [e].

CENT.
VIII.
PART II.

XIV. This universal depravity and corruption of the monks gave rise to a new order of priests

The origin
of the order
of canons.

[c] See MABILLON, *Præf. ad aſſa SS. Ord. Benedicti*, Sæc. i. p. 24. and Sæc. iv. part I. p. 26.

[d] The author, mentioned in the preceding note, discourses with a noble frankness and courage concerning the corruption of the monks and its various causes, in the same work, *Præf. ad Sæc. iv. part I. p. 64.*

[e] See the *Capitularia Caroli*, published by BALUZIVS, tom. i. p. 148. 157. 237. 355. 366. 375. 503. Laws so severe, and so often repeated, shew evidently that the corruption of the monks must have been truly enormous.

VOL. II.

R

in

CENT.
VIII.
PART II.

in the west, which was a sort of middle order between the *monks* or *regulars*, and the *secular clergy*. This new species of ecclesiastics adopted the monastic discipline and manner of life, so far as to have their dwelling and their table in common, and to assemble themselves at certain hours for divine service; but they entered not into the vows which were peculiar to the monks, and they were also appointed to discharge the ministerial functions in certain churches which were committed to their pastoral direction. These ecclesiastics were at first called *fratres dominici*, but soon after received the name of *canons* [f]. The common opinion attributes the institution of this order to CHRODEGANGUS, bishop of Metz: nor is this opinion destitute of truth [g]. For though before this time there were in *Italy*, *Africa*, and other provinces, convents of ecclesiastics, who lived after the manner of the *canons* [b]; yet CHRODEGANGUS, who, towards the middle of this century,

[f] See LE BEUF *Memoires sur l'Histoire d'Auxerre*, tom. i. p. 174. the *Paris* edition, published in 1743, in 4^{to}.

[g] See, for an account of CHRODEGANGUS, the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 123. CAI MET, *Histoire de Lorraine*, tom. i. p. 513. *Acta Sanctor.* tom. i. *Martin*, p. 452. The rule which he prescribed to his *canons*, may be seen in LE COINTE's *Annales Francor. Eccles.* tom. v. ad A. 757. §. 35; as also in the *Concilia Labbei*, tom. vii. 1444. He is not, however, the author of the rule which is published in his name, in the *Spicilegium veter. Scriptor.* tom. i. p. 565. LONGUEVAL, in his *Histoire de l'Eglise Gallicane*, tom. iv. p. 435. has given a neat and elegant abridgment of the rule of CHRODEGANGUS.

[b] See LUD. ANT. MURATOR. *Antiq. Italicar. medi ævi*, tom. v. p. 185; as also LUD. THOMASSIN. *Disciplina Ecclesiæ Vet. et Nov.* part I. lib. iii. The design of this institution was truly excellent. The authors of it, justly shocked at the vicious manners of a licentious clergy, hoped that this new institution would have a tendency to prevent the irregularities of that order, by delivering them from the cares, anxieties, and occupations of this present life. But the event has shewn how much these pious hopes have been disappointed.

sub,

subjected to this rule the clergy of *Metz*, not only added to their religious ceremonies the custom of singing hymns and anthems to God, at certain hours, and probably a variety of rites, but also, by his example, excited the Franks, the Italians, and the Germans, to distinguish themselves by their zeal in favour of the *canons*, to erect monasteries for them, and to introduce their rule into their respective countries.

XV. The supreme dominion over the church and its possessions was vested in the emperors and kings, both in the eastern and the western world. The sovereignty of the Grecian emperors, in this respect, has never been contested; and though the partizans of the Roman pontiffs endeavour to render dubious the supremacy of the Latin monarchs over the church, yet this supremacy is too manifest to be disputed by such as have considered the matter attentively [1], and it is acknowledged by the wisest and most candid writers even of the Romish communion. ADRIAN I. in a council of bishops assembled at *Rome*, conferred upon CHARLEMAGNE, and his successors, the right of election to the see of *Rome* [k]; and though neither CHARLEMAGNE, nor his son LEWIS, were willing to exercise this power in all its extent, by naming and creating the pontif upon every vacancy, yet they reserved the right of approving and confirming the person that was elected to that high dignity by the priests and people: nor was the consecration of the elected pontif of the least validity, unless performed in presence of the empe-

C F N T.
VIII.
PART II.

The authority of the Roman pontiffs limited by, and subordinated to, that of the emperors.

[1] For an accurate account of the rights of the Grecian emperors in religious matters, we refer the reader to LEQUEN'S *Oriens Christianus*, tom. i. p. 136.

[k] This *Act* is mentioned by ANASTASIUS: it has been preserved by YVO and GRATIAN, and has been the subject of a multitude of treatises.

CENT.
VIII.
PART II.

Confined
within nar-
row limits.

ror's ambassadors [l]. The Roman pontifs obeyed the laws of the emperors, received their judicial decisions as of indispensable obligation, and executed them with the utmost punctuality and submission [m]. The kings of the Franks appointed extraordinary judges, whom they called *envoys*, to inspect into the lives and manners of the clergy superior and inferior, to take cognizance of their contests, to terminate their disputes, to enact laws concerning the public worship, and to punish the crimes of the sacred order, as well as those of the other citizens [n]. All churches also, and monasteries, were obliged to pay to the public treasury a tribute proportioned to their respective lands and possessions, except such as, by the pure favour of the supreme powers, were graciously exempted from this general tax [o].

XVI. It is true, indeed, that the Latin emperors did not assume to themselves the administration of the church, or the cognizance and decision of controversies that were purely of a religious nature. They acknowledged, on the contrary, that these matters belonged to the tribunal of the Roman pontif and of the ecclesiastical

[l] See MABILION, *Comm. in Ordinem Romanum, Muse: Italici*, tom. ii. p. 113. MURATORI *Droits de l'Empire sur l'Etat Ecclesiastique*, p. 87.

[m] This has been amply demonstrated by BALUZIUS, in his *Præf. ad Capitularia Regum Francorum*, § 21.

[n] See MURATORI *Antiq. Ital. medi ævi*, tom. i. Diss. ix. p. 470. FRANC. de ROYE, *De Missis Dominicis*, cap. x. p. 44. cap. viii. p. 118. 134. 168. 195.

[o] See MURATORI *Antiq. Ital. medi ævi*, tom. i. Diss. xvii. p. 926. See also the collection of the various pieces that were published on occasion of the dispute between LEWIS XV. and his clergy, relating to the immunities of that order in France. These pieces were printed at the Hague in the year 1751, in seven volumes, 8vo, under the following title: *Écrits pour et contre les immunités prétendues par le Clergé de France*.

councils [p]. But this jurisdiction of the pontif was confined within narrow limits; he could decide nothing by his sole authority, but was obliged to convene a council when any religious differences were to be terminated by an authoritative judgment. Nor did the provinces, when any controversy arose, wait for the decision of the bishop of *Rome*; but assembled, by their own authority, their particular councils, in which the bishops gave their thoughts, with the utmost freedom, upon the points in debate, and voted often in direct opposition to what was known to be the opinion of the Roman pontif: all which is evident from what passed in the councils assembled by the Franks and Germans, in order to determine the celebrated controversy concerning the use and worship of images. It is further to be observed, that the power of convening councils, and the right of presiding in them, were the prerogatives of the emperors and sovereign princes, in whose dominions these assemblies were held; and that no decrees of any council obtained the force of laws, until they were approved and confirmed by the supreme magistrate [q]. Thus was the spiritual authority of *Rome* widely bounded by the civil power; but its ambitious pontifs fretted under the imperial curb, and eager to break loose their bonds, left no means unemployed for that purpose. Nay, they formed projects, which seemed less the effects of ambition than of phrenzy; for they claimed a supreme dominion, not only over the church, but also over kings themselves,

[p] See the Dissertation of CHARLEMAGNE, *De Imaginibus*, lib. i. cap. iv. p. 48. edit. Heumann.

[q] All this is fully and admirably demonstrated by BALUZIUS, in his Preface to the *Capitularia*, or laws of the kings of the Franks, and is also amply illustrated in that work. See also J. BASNAGE, *Histoire de l'Eglise*, tom. i. p. 270.

C E N T.
VIII.
P A R T II.

Grecian
and eastern
writers.

and pretended to reduce the whole universe under their ghostly jurisdiction. However extravagant these pretensions were, they were followed by the most vigorous efforts, and the wars and tumults that arose in the following century, contributed much to render these efforts successful.

XVII If we turn our eyes towards the writers of this century, we shall find very few that stand distinguished in the lists of fame, either on account of erudition or genius. Among the Greeks, the following only seem worthy of mention.

GERMANUS, bishop of *Constantinople*, the greatest part of whose high renown was due to his violent zeal for image-worship [r]

COSMAS, bishop of *Jerusalem*, who acquired some reputation by his *Lytic* vein, consecrated to the service of religion, and employed in composing hymns for public and private devotion.

GEORGE SYNCHELLUS and THEOPHANES, who are not the least considerable among the writers of the Byzantine history, though they be in all respects infinitely below the ancient Greek and Latin historians

But the writer, who surpassed all his contemporaries among the Greeks and Orientals, was JOHN DAMASCENUS, a man of genius and eloquence, who, in a variety of productions full of erudition, explained the Peripatetic philosophy, and illustrated the main and capital points of the Christian doctrine. It must, however, be acknowledged, that the eminent talents of this great man were tainted with that sordid superstition, and that excessive veneration for the ancient fathers, that were the reigning defects of the age he lived in, not to mention his wretched method of explaining

[r] See RICH. SIMON. *Critique de la Bibliothèque Ecclésiastique de M. DU PIN*, tom. i. p. 270.

the doctrines of the gospel according to the principles of the Aristotelian philosophy [s].

C E N T.
VIII.
PART II.

XVIII. The first place among the Latin writers is due to CHARLEMAGNE, whose love of letters was one of the bright ornaments of his imperial dignity. The laws which are known by the title of *Capitularia*, with several *Epistles*, and a *Book concerning images*, are attributed to this prince; though it seems highly probable, that the most of these compositions were drawn up by other pens [t].

Western
and Latin
writers.

After this learned prince, we may justly place venerable BEDL. so called from his illustrious virtues [u], ALCUIN [w], the preceptor of CHARLEMAGNE; PAULINUS of *Aquila* [x], who were all distinguished by their laborious application, and their zeal for the advancement of learning and science, and who treated the various branches of literature, that were known in this century, in such a manner as to convince us, that it was the infelicity of the time, rather than the want of genius, that hindered them from arising to higher degrees of perfection than what they attained to. Add to these, BONIFACE, of whom we

[s] BAYLE *Diction* tom. ii. p. 950, as also the account of the writing of JOHN AMASCENUS, which is published in LE QUILN's edition of his works, and was composed by LEO ALATIUS.

[t] See JO. A. FABRICII *Bibliotheca mediæ ævi Lat.* tom. i. p. 936 *Histoire Littéraire de France*, tom. iv. p. 378.

[u] See the *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. April. p. 866 *Gen. Dictionary*, at the article BEDL. A list of the writings of this venerable Briton, composed by him self, is published by MURATORI, in his *Antiq. Italicæ mediæ ævi*, tom. iii. p. 825.

[w] *Hist. Littér. de la France*, tom. iv. p. 295. *Gen. Dictionary*, at the article ALCUIN. CAFFLINOT, who has discovered the treatise of ALCUIN, *De Processione Spiritus S.* which has never been published, is preparing an edition of all the works of that learned writer. See the *Hist. Littéraire de la France*, tom. vii. *Præf.* p. 10.

[x] See *Hist. Littérature, &c.* tom. iv. p. 286. *Acta Sanct.* tom. i. *Januar.* p. 713.

C E N T. have already spoken; EGINARD, the celebrated
 VIII. author of the *Life of Charlemagne*, and other pro-
 PART II. ductions; PAUL, the deacon, who acquired a con-
 siderable and lasting reputation by his *History of the Lombards*, his *Book of Homilies*, and his miscellaneous labours; AMBROSE AUTHPERT, who wrote a commentary on the *Revelations*; and THEODULPHUS, bishop of Orleans; and thus we shall have a complete list of all the writers who acquired any degree of esteem in this century by their literary productions, either sacred or profane.

C H A P. III.

Concerning the doctrine of the Christian church during this century.

The Christian doctrine sadly corrupted.

I. THE fundamental doctrines of Christianity were, as yet, respected and preserved in the theological writings both of the Greeks and Latins, as seems evident from the discourse of JOHN DAMASCENUS *concerning the orthodox faith*, and the confession of faith which was drawn up by CHARLEMAGNE [y]. The pure seed of celestial truth was, however, choked by a monstrous and incredible quantity of noxious weeds. The rational simplicity of the Christian worship was corrupted by an idolatrous veneration for images, and other superstitious inventions, and the sacred

[y] See the treatise of this prince, *Concerning images*, book III. p. 259. ed. Heumann. Of the Greek writers, the reader may consult MICH. SYNCELLUS's *Confession of faith*, published by MONTFAUCON, in his *Bibliotheca Cosmiana*, p. 90: and among the Latins, *An exposition of the principal doctrine of the Christian religion*, composed by BENEDICT, abbot of Aniane, and published by BALUZIUS, in his *Miscellanea*, tom. v. p. 56; as also the *Creed* of LEO III. published in the same work, tom. vii. p. 18.

flame

flame of divine charity was extinguished by the violent contentions and animosities which the progress of these superstitions occasioned in the church. All acknowledged the efficacy of our Saviour's merits: and yet all, one way or another, laboured, in effect, to diminish the persuasion of this efficacy in the minds of men, by teaching, that Christians might appease an offended deity by voluntary acts of mortification, or by gifts and oblations lavished upon the church, and by exhorting such as were desirous of salvation to place their confidence in the works and merits of the saints. Were we to enlarge upon all the absurdities and superstitions which were invented to flatter the passions of the misguided multitude, and to increase, at the expence of reason and Christianity, the opulence and authority of a licentious clergy; such an immense quantity of odious materials would swell this work to an enormous size.

II. The piety in vogue during this and some succeeding ages consisted in building, and embellishing churches and chapels, in endowing monasteries, erecting basilics, hunting after the relics of saints and martyrs, and treating them with an excessive and absurd veneration, in procuring the intercession of the saints by rich oblations or superstitious rites, in worshipping images, in pilgrimages to those places which were esteemed holy, and chiefly to *Palestine*, and such like absurd and extravagant practices and institutions. The pious Christian, and the profligate transgressor, shewed equal zeal in the performance of these superstitious services, which were looked upon as of the highest efficacy in order to the attainment of eternal salvation; they were performed by the latter as an expiation for their crimes, and a mean of appeasing an offended deity; and by the former with a view to obtain, from above, the good things

CENT.
VIII.
PART II.

The piety
and morals
of this age.

CENT.
VIII.
PART II.

things of this life, and an easy and commodious passage to life eternal. The true genuine religion of Jesus, if we except a few of its doctrines contained in the *Creed*, was utterly unknown in this century, not only to the multitude in general, but also to the doctors of the first rank and eminence in the church, and the consequences of this corrupt ignorance were fatal to the interests of virtue. All orders of men, regardless of the obligations of morality, of the duties of the gospel, and of the culture and improvement of their minds, rushed headlong with a perfect security into all sorts of wickedness, from the delusive hopes, that by the intercession and prayers of the saints, and the credit of the priests at the throne of God, they would easily obtain the remission of their enormities, and render the deity propitious. This dismal account of the religion and morals of the eighth century, is confirmed by the unanimous testimony of all the historians who have written concerning that period.

Exegetical
or explanatory
theology.

III. The Greeks were of opinion, that the holy scriptures had been successfully interpreted and explained by the ancient commentators, and therefore imagined, that they rendered a most important service to the students in divinity, when, without either judgment or choice, they extracted or compiled from the works of these admired sages their explanatory observations on the sacred writings. The commentary of JOHN DAMASCENUS upon the epistles of St. PAUL, which was taken from the writings of CHRYSOSTOM, is alone sufficient to serve as a proof of the little discernment with which these compilations were generally made.

The Latin expositors may be divided into two classes, according to the different nature of their productions. In the first, we place those writers who, after the example of the Greeks, employed their

their labour in collecting into one body the interpretations and commentaries of the ancients. BEDE distinguished himself among the expositors of this class by his explication of the epistles of St. PAUL, drawn from the writings of AUGUSTIN and others [z]. Still more estimable are the writers of the second class, who made use of their own penetration and sagacity in investigating the sense of the holy scriptures.* Such as ALCUIN, AMBROSE AUTHPERT, the expositors of the *Revelations*, nay and BEDE also, who belongs, in reality, to both classes. It must, however, be acknowledged, that all these commentators were destitute of the qualities that are essential to the sacred critic; for we find them in their explications neglecting entirely the natural sense of the words of scripture, and running blindfold after a certain hidden and mystical meaning, which, to use their jargon, they usually divided into *allegorical*, *anagogical*, and *tropological* [a]; and thus they delivered their own rash fictions and crude fancies, as the true and genuine sentiments of the sacred writers. Of this we are furnished with many examples in ALCUIN's *commentary on St. John*; BEDE's *allegorical illustrations of the books of Samuel*; and CHARLEMAGNE's *book concerning images*, in which various passages of the holy scriptures are occasionally explained according to the taste of the times [b].

IV. The veneration of CHARLEMAGNE for the sacred writings was carried to such an excessive

Charle-
magne's
zeal for the
study of the
scriptures.

[z] See, for an account of the commentaries of BEDE, RICH. SIMON, *Critique de la Biblioth. Ecclesiast. de M. Du Pin*, tom. 3 p. 280. See also BEDE *Explicatio Geneseos expositus* in MARTENE's *Thesaur. Anecd.* tom. v. p. 111. 116. 140. and his interpretation of *Habakkuk*, ibid. p. 295.

[a] See CAROLUS MAGNUS *De Imaginibus*, lib. i. p. 138.

[b] See the same imperial author, book I. p. 84. 91. 123. 127. 13. 133. 136. 138. 145. 160. 164. 165, &c.

length,

CENT.
VIII.
PART II.

length [*c*], as to persuade that monarch, that they contained the latent seeds and principles of all arts and sciences; an opinion, no doubt, which he early imbibed from the lessons of his preceptor ALCUIN, and the other divines who frequented his court [*d*]. Hence the zeal with which that prince excited and encouraged the more learned among the clergy to direct their pious labours towards the illustration of the holy scriptures. Several laws which he published to encourage this species of learning are yet extant, as also various monuments of his deep solicitude about the advancement and propagation of Christian knowledge [*e*]. And lest the faults that were to be found in several places of the Latin translation of the scriptures should prove an obstacle to the execution and accomplishment of his pious views, he employed ALCUIN in correcting these errors, and is said, in the last years of his life, to have spent a considerable part of his time in the same learned and pious work [*f*]. It is also to his encouragement and direction, that some writers attribute the first German translation of the sacred writings, though others contend, that this honour is due to his son and successor LEWIS, surnamed the MEEK.

Misss its
aim by some
imprudent
appoint-
ments of
that empe-
ror.

V. This zeal and industry of the emperor contributed, no doubt, to rouse from their sloth a lazy and ignorant clergy, and to raise up a spirit of application to literary pursuits. We cannot, however, help observing, that this laborious prince imprudently established certain customs, and confirmed others, which had a manifest tendency to defeat, in a great measure, his laudable designs

[*c*] See CAROLUS MAGNUS, *De Imagin.* lib. i. p. 231. 236.

[*d*] JO. FRICKIUS, *De Canone Scripturæ Sacræ*, p. 184.

[*e*] BARONIUS *Annal. ad A. DCCLXXVIII.* n. XXVII. JO. A. FABRICIUS, *Biblioth. Lat. mediæ ævi*, tom. i. p. 950. JAC. USSERIUS, *De sacris et scripturis vernacul.* p. 110.

[*f*] J. A. FABRICII *Bibl. Lat. mediæ ævi*, tom. i. p. 950. USSERIUS, *De sacris et scripturis vernacul.* p. 110.

of promoting Christian knowledge. He confirmed the practice already in use, of reading and explaining to the people, in the public assemblies, certain portions only of the scriptures; and reduced the different methods of worship followed in different churches into one fixed rule, which was to be observed with the most perfect uniformity in all [g]. Persuaded also that few of the

[g] They who imagine that the portions of scripture which are still explained, every year, to Christians in their religious assemblies, were selected for that purpose by the order of CHARLEMAGNE, are undoubtedly mistaken; since it is manifest, that in the preceding ages there were certain portions of scripture set apart for each day of worship in the greatest part of the Latin churches. See JO. HENRI. THAMER *Schediasma de origine et dignitate pericoparum quæ Evangelia et Epistolæ vulgo vocantur*. See also J. FRANC. BUDDÉI *Isagogæ ad Theologiam*, tom. ii. p. 1640. It must, however, be confessed, that CHARLEMAGNE introduced some new regulations into this part of divine service; for whereas, before his time, the Latin churches differed from each other in several circumstances of the public worship, and particularly in this, that the same portions of scripture were not read and explained in them all, he published a solemn edict, commanding all the religious assemblies within his territories to conform themselves to the rule of worship and divine service established in the *church of Rome*. With respect to the portions of scripture which we call the *epistles* and *gospels*, and which, from the time of CHARLEMAGNE down to us, continue to be used in divine worship, it is certain that they were read in the church of *Rome* so early as the sixth century. It is also certain, that this prince was extremely careful in reforming the service of the Latin churches, and appointed the form of worship used at *Rome* to be observed in them all. Hence the churches, which did not adopt the Roman ritual, have different *epistles* and *gospels* from those which are used by us and the other western churches, who were commanded by CHARLEMAGNE to imitate the Roman service. The church of *Corbetta* is an example of this, as may be seen in MURATORI'S *Antiq. Ital.* tom. iv. p. 836; and also the church of *Milan*, which follows the rite of St. AMBROSE. If any are desirous to know what *epistles* and *gospels* were used by the Franks and other western churches before the time of CHARLEMAGNE, they have only to consult the *Calendars* published by MARTENE, in his *Thesaur. Anecd.* tom. v. p. 66. the *Discourses* of BEDE, published in the same work, tom. v. p. 339. and MABILLON, *De Antiqua Liturgia Gallicana*; to all which may be added PEYRAT, *Antiquités de la Chapelle de Roi de France*. v. 566.

clergy

CENT
VIII.
PART II.

clergy were capable of explaining with perspicuity and judgment the portions of scripture which are distinguished in the ritual by the name of epistle and gospel, he ordered PAUL DEACON and ALCUIN to compile, from the ancient doctors of the church, *homilies*, or discourses upon the epistles and gospels, which a stupid and ignorant set of priests were to commit to memory, and recite to the people. This gave rise to that famous collection, which went by the title of the *homiliarium of Charlemagne* [b], and which being followed as a model by many productions of the same kind composed by private persons from a principle of pious zeal, contributed much to nourish the indolence, and to perpetuate the ignorance of a worthless clergy [c]. The zeal and activity of this great prince did not stop here; for he ordered the lives of the principal saints to be written in a moderate volume, of which copies were dispersed throughout his dominions, that the people might have in the dead, examples of piety and virtue, which were no where to be found among the living. All these projects and designs were certainly formed and executed with upright and pious intentions, and, considering the state

[b] See, for an account of this book of *Homilies*, the learned SHELLEN's *Selesta Litteraria*, p. 252.

[c] ALAN, abbot of *Farfa* in *Italy*, wrote in this century an enormous *Book of Homilies*, the preface to which is published by BERNARD PEZIUS, in the *Thesaur. Anecd.* tom. vi. part I. p. 83. In the following age several works under the same title were composed by learned men; one by HAGMO, of *Halberstadt*, which is still extant; another by RABANUS MAURUS, at the request of the emperor LOTHAIRE; and a third by HILRICUS, mentioned by PEZIUS in the work above quoted, p. 93. All these were wrote in Latin. The famous OTTFRID, of *Weissenbourg*, was the first who composed a *Book of Homilies* in the Teutonic language; for an account of this work, which was written in the ninth century, see LAMBECIUS, *De Bibliotheca Fridebon. Augusta*, tom. ii. cap. v. p. 419.

of

of things in this century, were, in several respects, both useful and necessary; they, however, contrary to the emperor's intention, contributed, undoubtedly, to encourage the priests in their criminal sloth, and their shameful neglect of the study of the scriptures. For the greatest part of them* employed their time and labour only upon those parts of the sacred writings, which the emperor had appointed to be read in the churches, and explained to the people; and never attempted to exercise their capacities upon the rest of the divine word. The greatest part of the clergy also, instead of composing themselves the discourses they recited in public, confined themselves to their book of homilies, that was published by the authority of their sovereign, and thus let their talents lie uncultivated and unemployed.

C E N T.
VIII.
P A R T II.

VI. None of the Latins carried their theological enterprizes so far as to give a complete, connected, and accurate system of the various doctrines of Christianity. It would be absurd to comprehend,* under this title, the various discourses concerning the person and nature of CHRIST, which were designed to refute the errors of FELIX [k] and ELIPAND, or to combat the opinions which were now spread abroad concerning the origin of the Holy Ghost [l], and several other points; since these discourses afford no proofs either of precision or diligence in their

The state
of didactic
theology.

✎ [k] The doctrine taught by FELIX, bishop of *Urgella*, and his disciple ELIPAND, archbishop of *Toledo*, was, that JESUS CHRIST was the son of God not by *nature*, but by *adoption*. This doctrine was also intimately connected with the Nestorian hypothesis, and was condemned, in this century, by the synod of *Ratisbon*, and the councils of *Frankfort* and *Trioul*.

✎ [l] The error now published relating to the *Holy Ghost* was, that it proceeded from the father *only*, and not from the father and the son.

authors.

CENT.
VIII.
PART II.

authors. The labours and industry of the divines of this age were totally employed in collecting the opinions and authorities of the *fathers*, by whom are meant the theological writers of the first six centuries; and so blind and servile was their veneration for these doctors, that they regarded their dictates as infallible, and their writings as the boundaries of truth, beyond which reason was not permitted to push its researches. The Irish or Hibernians, who in this century were known by the name of *Scots*, were the only divines who refused to dishonour their reason by submitting it implicitly to the dictates of authority. Naturally subtle and sagacious, they applied their philosophy, such as it was, to the illustration of the truth and doctrines of religion; a method which was almost generally abhorred and exploded in all other nations [m].

The

[m] That the Hibernians, who were called *Scots* in this century, were lovers of learning, and distinguished themselves, in these times of ignorance, by the culture of the sciences beyond all the other European nations, travelling through the most distant lands, both with a view to improve and to communicate their knowledge, is a fact with which I have long been acquainted, as we see them, in the most authentic records of antiquity, discharging, with the highest reputation and applause, the function of doctor in *France, Germany, and Italy*, both during this and the following century. But that these Hibernians were the first teachers of the *scholastic theology* in *Europe*, and so early as the eighth century illustrated the doctrines of religion by the principles of philosophy, I learned but lately from the testimony of BENEDICT, abbot of *Aniane*, in the province of *Languedoc*, who lived in this period, and some of whose productions are published by BALUZIUS, in the fifth volume of his *Miscellanea*. This learned abbot, in his *Letter to Guarnanius*, p. 54. expresses himself thus: "Apud modernos scholasticos (i.e. public teachers, or school-masters) maxime apud SCOTOS est syllogismus delusionis, ut dicant, Trinitatem, sicut personarum, ita esse substantiarum;" (by this it appears that the Irish divines made use of a certain syllogism, which BENEDICT calls *delusive*, i.e. fallacious and sophistical, to demonstrate that the persons in the God-head

The Greeks were not so destitute of systematical divines as the Latins. JOHN DAMASCENUS composed a complete body of the Christian doctrine in a scientific method, under the title of *Four Books concerning the Orthodox Faith*. The two kinds of *Theology*, which the Latins termed *scholastic* and *didactic*, were united in this laborious performance, in which the author not only explains the doctrines he delivers by subtle and profound reasoning, but also confirms his explanations by the authority of the ancient doctors. This book was received among the Greeks with the highest applause, and was so excessively admired, that at length it came to be acknowledged among that people as the only rule of divine truth. Many, however, complain of this applauded writer, as having consulted more, in his theological system, the conjectures of human rea-

head were *substances*: a captious syllogism this, as we may see from what follows, and also every way proper to throw the ignorant into the greatest perplexity) “ quatenus si ad-
“ fenserit illectus auditor, Trinitatem esse trium substantia-
“ rum Deum, trium derogetur cultor Deorum: si autem ab-
“ nuerit, personarum denegator culpetur.” It was with this miserable piece of sophistry, that these subtle divines puzzled and tormented their disciples and hearers, accusing those of *Trinitarism* who admitted their argument, and casting the reproach of *Sabellianism* upon those who rejected it. For thus they reasoned, or rather quibbled; “ You must either affirm
“ or deny that the Three Persons in the Deity are Three
“ Substances. If you affirm it, you are undoubtedly a *Tri-*
“ *theist*, and worship Three Gods: if you deny it, this de-
“ nial implies that they are not three distinct persons, and
“ thus you fall into *Sabellianism*.” BENEDICT condemns this Hibernian subtilty, and severely animadverts upon the introduction of it into theology; he also recommends in its place that amiable simplicity that is so conformable to the nature and genius of the gospel: “ Sed hæc de fide (says
“ he) et omnis caliditatis versutia simplicitate fidei catholi-
“ cæ est puritate vitanda, non captiosa interjectione lingua-
“ rum, scæva impactione interpolanda.” From hence it ap-
pears, that the philosophical or scholastic theology among the Latins, is of more ancient date than is commonly imagined.

CENT.
VIII.
PART II.

son, and the opinions of the ancients, than the genuine dictates of the sacred oracles, and of having, in consequence of this method, deviated from the true source and the essential principles of theology [n]. To the work of DAMASCENUS now mentioned, we may add his *Sacred Parallels*, in which he has collected, with uncommon care and industry, the opinions of the ancient doctors concerning the various points of the Christian religion. We may, therefore, look upon this writer as the THOMAS and LOMBARD of the Greeks.

Moral writers.

VII. None of the moral writers of this century attempted forming a complete system of the duties and virtues of the Christian life. JOHN, surnamed CARPATHIUS, a Greek writer, composed some *exhortatory discourses*, in which there are scarcely any marks of judgment or genius. Among the monastic orders nothing was relished but the enthusiastic strains of the Mystics, and the doctrines of DIONYSIUS the Areopagite, their pretended chief, whose supposititious writings were interpreted and explained by JOHANNES DARENSIS out of complaisance to the monks [o]. The Latin writers confined their labours in morality to some general precepts concerning virtue and vice, that seemed rather destined to regulate the external actions of Christians, than to purify their inward principles, or to fix duty upon its proper foundations. Their precepts also, such as they were, and their manner of explaining them, had now imbibed a strong tincture of the Peripatetic philosophy, as appears from certain treatises of BEDE, and the *treatise of* ALCUIN, *concerning vir-*

[n] JO. HENR. HOTTINGER. *Bibliothecar. Quædripart.* lib. iii. cap. ii. § 3. p. 372. MART. CHEMNITIUS, *De usu et utilitate Locor. Commun.* p. 26.

[o] JOS. SIMON ASSEMANNI *Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican.* tom. ii. p. 129.

tue and vice [p]. That the people, however, might be animated to the pursuit of virtue by the commanding power of example, BEDE, FLORUS, ALCUIN, MARCELLINUS, AMBROSE AUTHPERT, and others, employed their pious industry in writing the lives of such as had been eminent for their piety, and worthy deeds.

CENT.
VIII.
PART II.

VIII. The controversies that turned upon the main and essential points of religion were, during this century, few in number, and scarcely any of them managed with tolerable sagacity or judgment. The greatest part of the Greeks were involved in the dispute concerning images, in which their reasonings were utterly destitute of precision and perspicuity; while the Latins employed their chief zeal and industry in confuting and extirpating the doctrine of ELIPAND concerning the person of CHRIST. JOHN DAMASCENUS exposed the errors of all the different sects in a short, but useful and interesting treatise; he also attacked the Manichæans and Nestorians with a particular vehemence, and even went so far in his polemic labours, as to combat the erroneous doctrine of the Saracens. In these compositions we find several proofs of subtilty and genius, but very little of that clearness and simplicity that constitute the chief merit of polemic writings. The Jews were left almost untroubled, as the Christians were sufficiently employed by the controversies that had arisen among themselves: ANASTASIUS, abbot of *Palestine*, made, however, some attempts to subdue the infidelity of that obstinate people.

Controversies.

IX. Of all the controversies which agitated and perplexed the Christian church during this century, that which arose concerning the worship of

The origin of the dispute concerning the worship of images.

[p] This treatise is extant in the works of ALCUIN, published by QUERCETANUS, tom. II. p. 1218.

CENT.
VIII.
PART II.

images in *Greece*, and was carried from thence into both the eastern and western provinces, was the most unhappy and pernicious in its consequences. The first sparks of this terrible flame, that had like to have proved fatal both to the interests of religion and government, had already appeared under the reign of PHILLIPICUS BARDANES, who was created emperor of the Greeks a little after the commencement of this century. This prince, with the consent of JOHN patriarch of *Constantinople*, ordered a picture, which represented the sixth general council, to be pulled down from its place in the church of *St. Sophia*, A. D. 712; because this council had condemned the Monothelites, whose cause the emperor espoused with the greatest ardor and vehemence. Nor did BARDANES stop here; but sent immediately an order to *Rome* to remove all images of that nature from the churches and other places of worship. His orders, however, were far from being received with submission, or producing their designed effect; on the contrary, CONSTANTINE, the Roman pontif, not only rejected, by a formal protest, the imperial edict, but resolved to express his contempt of it by his actions as well as his words: He ordered six pictures, representing the six general councils, to be placed in the porch of *St. Peter's* church; and, that no act of rebellion or arrogance might be left unemployed, he assembled a council at *Rome*, in which he caused the emperor himself to be condemned as an apostate from the true religion. These first tumults were quelled by a revolution, which, the year following, deprived BARDANES of the imperial throne [q].

[q] See FRED. SPANHEMII *Historia imaginum restituta*, which is published in the second volume of his works, and also printed apart. MAIMBOURG's History of this controversy, which is full of the most absurd and malignant fictions. MURATORI *Annali d' Italia*, tom. iv. p. 221.

X. The

X. The dispute, however, broke out with redoubled fury under LEO the Isaurian, a prince of the greatest resolution and intrepidity, and the new tumults it excited were both violent and durable. LEO, unable to bear any longer the excessive height to which the Greeks carried their superstitious attachment to the worship of images, and the sharp raileries and serious reproaches which this idolatrous service drew upon the Christians from the Jews and Saracens, determined, by the most vigorous proceedings, to root out at once this growing evil. For this purpose he issued out an edict, A. D. 726, by which it was ordered, not only that the worship of images should be abrogated and relinquished, but also that all the images, except that of CHRIST's crucifixion, should be removed out of the churches [r]. In this proceeding the emperor acted more from the impulse of his natural character, which was warm and vehement, than from the dictates of prudence, which avoids precipitancy where prejudices are to be combated, and destroys and mines inveterate superstitions rather by slow and imperceptible attacks, than by open and violent assaults. The imperial edict produced such effects as might have been expected from the frantic enthusiasm of a supersti-

CENT
VIII.
PART II.

Its progress
under Leo
the Isaurian.

[r] In this account of the imperial edict, Dr. MOSHEIM follows the opinions of BARONIUS, FLEURY, and LE SUEUR. Others affirm, with more probability, that this famous edict did not enjoin the pulling down images every where, and casting them out of the churches, but only prohibited the paying to them any kind of adoration or worship. It would seem as if LEO was not, at first, averse to the use of images, as ornaments, or even as helps to devotion and memory; for at the same time that he forbid them to be worshipped, he ordered them to be placed higher in the churches, say some, to avoid this adoration; but afterwards finding that they were the occasion of idolatry, he had them removed from the churches and broken.

CENT.
VIII.
PART II.

The contest between the partisans of images who were called *Iconoduli*, and their opposers, who were called *Iconoclastæ*.

tious people. A civil war broke out in the islands of the Archipelago, ravaged a part of *Asia*, and afterwards reached *Italy*. The people, partly from their own ignorance, but principally in consequence of the perfidious suggestions of the priests and monks, who had artfully rendered the worship of images a source of opulence to their churches and cloisters, were led to regard the emperor as an apostate, and hence they considered themselves as freed from their oath of allegiance, and from all the obligations that attach subjects to their lawful sovereign.

XI. The Roman pontifs GREGORY I. and II., were the authors and ringleaders of these civil commotions and insurrections in *Italy*. The former, upon the emperor's refusing to revoke his edict against images, declared him, without hesitation, unworthy of the name and privileges of a Christian, and thus excluded him from the communion of the church; and no sooner was this formidable sentence made public, than the Romans, and other Italian provinces, that were subject to the Grecian empire, violated their allegiance, and rising in arms, either massacred or banished all the emperor's deputies and officers. LEO, exasperated by these insolent proceedings, resolved to chastise the Italian rebels, and to make the haughty pontif feel, in a particular manner, the effects of his resentment; but he failed in the attempt. Doubly irritated by this disappointment, he vented his fury against images, and their worshippers, in the year 730, in a much more terrible manner than he had hitherto done; for, in a council assembled at *Constantinople*, he degraded from his office GERMANUS, the bishop of that imperial city, who was a patron of images, put ANASTASIUS in his place, ordered all the images to be publickly burnt, and inflicted a variety of severe punishments upon such as were attached

tached to that idolatrous worship: These rigorous measures divided the Christian church into two violent factions, whose contests were carried on with an ungoverned rage, and produced nothing but mutual invectives, crimes, and assassinations. Of these factions, the one adopted the adoration and worship of images, and were on that account called *Iconoduli* or *Iconolatæ*; while the other maintained that such worship was unlawful, and that nothing was more worthy of the zeal of Christians, than to demolish and destroy those statues and pictures that were the occasions and objects of this gross idolatry, and hence they were distinguished by the titles of *Iconomachi* and *Iconoclastæ*. The furious zeal which GREGORY II. had shewn in defending the odious superstition of image-worship, was not only imitated, but even surpassed by his successor, who was the third pontif of that name; and though, at this distance of time, we are not acquainted with all the criminal circumstances that attended the intemperate zeal of these insolent prelates, yet we know with the utmost certainty, that it was owing to their extravagant attachment to image-worship that the Italian provinces were torn from the Grecian empire [s].

XII.

[s] The Greek writers tell us, that both the GREGORIES carried their insolence so far as to excommunicate LEO and his son CONSTANTINE, to dissolve the obligation of the oath of allegiance, which the people of *Italy* had taken to these princes, and to prohibit their paying tribute to them, or shewing them any marks of submission and obedience. These facts are also acknowledged by many of the partisans of the Roman pontiffs, such as BARONIUS, SIGONIUS *De Regno Italie*, and their numerous followers. On the other hand, some learned writers, particularly among the French, alleviate considerably the crime of the GREGORIES, and positively deny that they either excommunicated the emperors above mentioned, or called off the people from their duty and allegiance. See LAUNOIUS, *Epistolar. lib. vii. Ep. vii. p. 456. tom. v. opp.*

CENT.
VIII.
PART II.

—
Their progress under
Constantine
Coptonymus.

XII. CONSTANTINE, to whom the furious tribe of the image-worshippers had given by way of derision the name of COPRONYMUS [†], succeeded his father LEO in the empire A. D. 741, and, animated with an equal zeal and ardour against the new idolatry, employed all his influence in extirpating and abolishing the worship of images, in opposition to the vigorous efforts of the Roman pontiffs, and the superstitious monks. His manner of proceeding was attended with greater marks of equity and moderation, than had appeared in the measures pursued by LEO; for, knowing the respect which the Greeks had for the decisions of general councils, whose authority they considered as supreme and unlimited in religious matters, he assembled at *Constantinople*, A. D. 754, a council composed of the eastern bishops, in order to have this important question examined with the utmost care, and decided with wisdom, seconded by a just and lawful authority. This

par. II. NAT. ALEXANDER, *Select. Histor. Ecclesiast. Capit.* Sæc. viii. Dissert. i. p. 456. PETR. de MARCA, *Concordiæ Sacerdotii et Imperii*, lib. iii. cap. xi. BOSSUET, *Defens. Declarationis Cleri Gallic. de potestate Eccles.* par. I. lib. vi. cap. xii. p. 197. GIANNONE, *Histoire Civile de Naples*, tom. i. p. 400. All these found their opinions, concerning the conduct of the GREGORIES, chiefly upon the authority of the Latin writers, such as ANASTASIUS, PAUL DEACON, and others, who seem to have known nothing of that audacious insolence, with which these pontiffs are said to have opposed the emperors, and even represent them as having given several marks of their submission and obedience to the imperial authority. Such are the contrary accounts of the Greek and Latin writers; and the most prudent use we can make of them is, to suspend our judgment with respect to a matter, which the obscurity that covers the history of this period renders it impossible to clear up. All that we can know with certainty is, that the zeal of the two pontiffs above mentioned for the worship of images, furnished to the people of *Italy* the occasion of falling from their allegiance to the Grecian emperors.

☞ [†] This nick-name was given to CONSTANTINE, from his having defiled the sacred font at his baptism.

assembly,

assembly, which the Greeks regard as the *seventh œcumenical council*, gave judgment, as was the custom of those times, in favour of the opinion embraced by the emperor, and solemnly condemned the worship and also the use of images [u]. But this decision was not sufficient to vanquish the blind obstinacy of superstition; many adhered still to their idolatrous worship, and none made a more turbulent resistance to the wise decree of this council than the monks, who still continued to excite commotions in the state, and to blow the flames of sedition and rebellion among the people. Their malignity was, however, chastised by CONSTANTINE, who, filled with a just indignation at their seditious practices, punished several of them in an exemplary manner, and by new laws set bounds to the violence of monastic rage. LEO IV. who, after the death of CONSTANTINE, was declared emperor A. D. 775, adopted the sentiments of his father and grandfather, and pursued the measures which they had concerted for the extirpation of idolatry out of the Christian church; for having perceived that the worshippers of images could not be engaged by mild and gentle proceedings to abandon this superstitious practice, he had recourse to the coercive influence of penal laws.

XIII. A cup of poison, administered by the impious counsel of a perfidious spouse, deprived LEO IV. of his life A. D. 780, and rendered the idolatrous cause of images triumphant. The profligate IRENE, after having thus accomplished the death of her husband, held the reins of empire during the minority of her son CONSTANTINE; and, to establish her authority on more

Under
Irene.

[u] The authority of this council is not acknowledged by the Roman catholicks, no more than the obligation of the *second commandment*, which they have prudently struck out of the decalogue.

CENT.
VIII.
PART II.

solid foundations, entered into an alliance with ADRIAN, bishop of *Rome*, A. D. 786, and summoned a council at *Nice* in *Bythinia*, which is known by the title of the *second Nicene council*. In this assembly the imperial laws concerning the new idolatry were abrogated, the decrees of the council of *Constantinople* reversed, the worship of images and of the crofs restored, and severe punishments denounced against such as maintained that God was the only object of religious adoration. It is impossible to imagine any thing more ridiculous and trifling than the arguments upon which the bishops, assembled in this council, founded their decrees [*w*]. The authority, however, of these decrees was held sacred by the Romans, and the Greeks considered in the light of parricides and traitors all such as refused to submit to them. The other enormities of the flagitious IRENE, and her deserved fate, cannot, with propriety, be treated of here.

The council of
Francfort.

XIV. In these violent contests, the most of the Latins, such as the Britons, Germans, and Gauls, seemed to steer a middle way between the opposite tenets of the contending parties. They were of opinion that images might be lawfully preserved, and even placed in the churches, but, at the same time, they looked upon all worship of them as highly injurious and offensive to the Supreme Being [*x*]. Such, particularly, were the sentiments of CHARLEMAGNE, who distinguished himself in this important controversy. By the advice of the French bishops, who were no friends to this second council of *Nice*, he ordered some

[*w*] MART. CHEMELITIUS, *Examen Concilii Tridentini*, par. iv. loc. ii. cap. v. p. 52. LENFANT, *Préservatif contre la Reunion avec le Siege de la Rome*, par. iii. lettre xvii. p. 446.

[*x*] The aversion the Britons had to the worship of images may be seen in SPELMAN *ad Concilia Magnæ Britanniae*, tom. i. p. 73.

learned

learned and judicious divine to compose *Four Books concerning images*, which he sent, in the year 790, to ADRIAN, the Roman pontif, with a view to engage him to withdraw his approbation of the decrees of that council. In this performance the reasons alleged by the *Nicene* bishops to justify the worship of images, are refuted with great accuracy and spirit [y]. They were not, however, left without defence; ADRIAN, who was afraid of acknowledging even an emperor for his master, composed an answer to the *Four Books* mentioned above, but neither his arguments, nor his authority, were sufficient to support the superstition he endeavoured to maintain; for, in the year 794, CHARLEMAGNE assembled, at *Francfort* on the *Maine*, a council of three hundred bishops, in order to re-examine this important question, in which the opinion contained in the *Four Books* was solemnly confirmed, and the worship of images unanimously condemned [z]. From hence we may conclude, that in this century the Latins

[y] The books of CHARLEMAGNE concerning *Images*, which deserve an attentive perusal, are yet extant; and when they were become extremely scarce, were republished at *Hanover*, in 8vo, in 1731, by the celebrated CHRISTOPHER. AUG. HEUMAN, who enriched this edition with a learned Preface. These books are adorned with the venerable name of CHARLEMAGNE; but it is easy to perceive that they are the production of a scholastic divine, and not of an emperor. Several learned men have conjectured, that CHARLEMAGNE composed these books with the assistance of his preceptor ALCUIN; see HEUMANNI *Præf.* p. 51. and BUNAU *Historia Imperii German.* tom. 1. p. 490. This conjecture, though far from being contemptible, cannot be admitted without hesitation; since ALCUIN was in *England* when these books were composed. We learn from the history of his life, that he went into *England* A. D. 789, and did not return from thence before 792.

[z] This event is treated with a degree of candour not more laudable, than surprising, by MABILLON, in *Præf. ad Sæculum* iv. *Ætiorum SS. Ord. Benedicti.* part V. See also Jo. GEORG. DORSCHKEUS, *Collat. ad Concilium Francofordiense*, *Argentor.* 1649, in 4to.

deemed

CENT.
VIII.
PART II.

The controversy
about the
derivation
of the Holy
Ghost.

deemed it neither impious, nor unlawful, to dissent from the opinion of the Roman pontiff, and even to charge that prelate with error.

XV. While the controversy concerning images was at its height, a new contest arose among the Latins and Greeks about the source from whence the Holy Ghost *proceeded*. The Latins affirmed, that this divine spirit proceeded from the father and the son; the Greeks, on the contrary, asserted, that it proceeded from the father only. The origin of this controversy is covered with perplexity and doubt. It is, however, certain, that it was agitated in the council of *Gentili*, near *Paris*, A. D. 767, in presence of the emperor's legates [a], and from this we may conclude, with a high degree of probability, that it arose in *Greece* at that time when the contest about images was carried on with the greatest vehemence. In this controversy the Latins alleged, in favour of their opinion, the creed of *Constantinople*, which the Spaniards and French had successively corrupted (upon what occasion is not well known), by adding the words *filiusque* in that part of it which contained the doctrine concerning the Holy Ghost. The Greeks, on the other hand, made loud complaints of this criminal attempt of the Latins to corrupt by a manifest interpolation a creed, which served as a rule of doctrine for the church universal, and declared this attempt impudent and sacrilegious. Thus the dispute changed at length its object, and was transferred from the matter to the interpolated word above mentioned [b]: in the following century it was carried

[a] See LE COINTE *Annales Eccles. Francorum*, tom. v. p. 698.

[b] Learned men generally imagine that this controversy began about the word *filiusque*, which some of the Latins had added to the Creed that had been drawn up by the council of *Constantinople*,

carried on with still greater vehemence, and added new fuel to the dissensions which already portended a schism between the eastern and western churches [c].

CENT.
VIII.
PART II.

C H A P. IV.

Concerning the rites and ceremonies used in the church during this century.

I. **T**HE religion of this century consisted almost entirely in a motley round of external rites and ceremonies. We are not, therefore, to wonder that more zeal and diligence were employed in multiplying and regulating these outward marks of a superstitious devotion, than in

Ceremonies
multiplied.

Constantinople, and that from the word the dispute proceeded to the doctrine itself; see MABILLON, *Act. Sanctior. Ord. Bened. Sæc. iv. par. I. Præf.* p. iv. who is followed by many in this opinion. But this opinion is certainly erroneous. The doctrine was the first subject of controversy, which afterwards extended to the word *filioque*, considered by the Greeks as a manifest interpolation. Among other proofs of this, the council of *Gentili* shews evidently, that the doctrine concerning the Holy Spirit had been, for a considerable time, the subject of controversy, when the dispute arose about the word now mentioned. PAGI, in his *Critica in Baronium*, tom. iii. p. 323, is of opinion, that this controversy had both its date and its occasion from the dispute concerning images: for when the Latins treated the Greeks as heretics, on account of their opposition to image-worship, the Greeks, in their turn, charged the Latins also with heresy, on account of their maintaining that the Holy Ghost proceeded from the father and the son. The learned critic has, however, advanced this opinion without sufficient proof, and we must therefore consider it as no more than a probable conjecture.

[c] See PITHOEI *Hist. controuv. de processione Spiritus S.* at the end of his *Codex Canon. Eccles. Roman.* p. 355. LE QUIEN, *Oriens Christian.* tom. iii. p. 354. GER. J. VOSSIIUS, *De Tribus Symbolis*, *Diss.* iii. p. 65: and above all, JO. GEORG. WALCHIUS, *Histor. Controuv. de Processione Spiritus S.* published in 8vo, at Jena, in 1751.

correcting

C E N T.
VIII.
P A R T II.

correcting the vices and follies of men, in enlightening their understandings, and forming their hearts. The administration of the sacrament of the Lord's supper, which was deemed the most solemn and important branch of divine worship, was now every where embellished, or rather deformed, with a variety of senseless fopperies, which destroyed the beautiful simplicity of that affecting and salutary institution. We also find manifest traces in this century, of that superstitious custom of celebrating what were called *solitary masses* [d], though it be difficult to decide whether they were instituted by a public law, or introduced by the authority of private persons [e]. Be that as it may, this single custom is sufficient to give us an idea of the superstition and darkness that sat brooding over the Christian church in this ignorant age, and renders it unnecessary to enter into a further detail of the absurd rites with which a designing priesthood continued to disfigure the religion of Jesus.

Charle-
magne's
zeal for the
rites of the
church of
Rome.

II. CHARLEMAGNE seemed disposed to stem this torrent of superstition, which gathered force from day to day; for not to mention the zeal with which he opposed the worship of images, there are other circumstances that bear testimony to his intentions in this matter, such as his preventing the multiplication of festivals, by reducing them to a fixed and limited number, his prohibiting the ceremony of consecrating the

☞ [d] *Solitary or private masses* were those that were celebrated by the priest alone in behalf of souls detained in purgatory, as well as upon some other particular occasions. These masses were prohibited by the laws of church, but they were a rich source of profit to the clergy. They were condemned by the canons of a synod assembled at *Mentz* under CHARLEMAGNE, as criminal innovations, and as the fruits of avarice and sloth.

[e] See CHARLEMAGNE's book *concerning Images*, p. 245; as also GEORGE CALIXTUS, *De Missis Solitariis*, § 12.

church

church bells by the rite of holy asperſion, and other eccleſiaſtical laws of his enacting, which redound to his honour. Several circumſtances, however, concurred to render his deſigns abortive, and to blaſt the ſucceſs of his worthy purpoſes, and none more than his exceſſive attachment to the Roman pontifs, who were the patrons and protectors of thoſe who exerted themſelves in the cauſe of ceremonies. This vehement paſſion for the lordly pontif was inherited by the great prince of whom we are now ſpeaking, from his father PEPIN, who had already commanded the manner of ſinging, and the kind of church-muſic in uſe at *Rome*, to be obſerved every where in all Chriſtian churches. It was in conformity with his example, and in compliance with the repeated and importunate ſolicitation of the pontif ADRIAN, that CHARLEMAGNE laboured to bring all the Latin churches to follow, as their model, the church of *Rome*, not only in the article now mentioned, but alſo in the whole form of their worſhip, in every circumſtance of their religious ſervice [f]. Several churches however, among which thoſe of *Milan* and *Corbetta* diſtinguiſhed themſelves eminently, abſolutely rejected this propoſal, and could neither be brought, by perſuaſion nor violence, to change their uſual method of worſhip.

[f] See CHARLEMAGNE'S *Treatiſe concerning Images*, book I. p. 52. EGINARD, *De vita Caroli Magni*, cap. 26. p. 94. edit. Beſſeln.

C H A P. V.

Concerning the divisions and heresies that troubled the church during this century.

C E N T. I.
VIII.
P A R T II.

The an-
cient sects
recover
strength,

Clemens
and Adal-
bert.

THE Arians, Manicheans, and Marcionites, though often depressed by the force of penal laws and the power of the secular arm, gathered strength in the east, amidst the tumults and divisions with which the Grecian empire was perpetually agitated, and drew great numbers into the profession of their opinions [g]. The Monothelites, to whose cause the emperor PHILIPPICUS, and many others of the first rank and dignity were most zealous well-wishers, regained their credit in several places. The condition also of both the Nestorians and Monophysites was easy and agreeable under the dominion of the Arabians; their power and influence was considerable; nor were they destitute of means of weakening the Greeks their irreconcilable adversaries, and of spreading their doctrines, and multiplying every where the number of their adherents.

II. In the church which BONIFACE had newly erected in *Germany*, he himself tells us, that there were many perverse and erroneous reprobates, who had no true notion of religion, and his friends and adherents confirm this assertion. But the testimony both of the one and the others is undoubtedly partial, and unworthy of credit; since it appears from the most evident proofs, that the persons here accused of errors and heresies were Irish and French divines, who refused that blind submission to the church of *Rome*, which BONIFACE was so zealous to propagate every where.

[g] In *Europe* also Arianism prevailed greatly among the barbarous nations that embraced the Christian faith.

ADALBERT a Gaul, and CLEMENT a native of *Ireland*, were the persons whose opposition gave the most trouble to the ambitious legate. The former got himself consecrated bishop without the consent of BONIFACE, excited seditions and tumults among the eastern Franks, and appears, indeed, to have been both flagitious in his conduct and erroneous in his opinions; among other irregularities, he was the forger [b] of a letter to the human race, which was said to have been written by JESUS CHRIST, and to have been carried from heaven by the arch-angel MICHAEL [i]. As to CLEMENT, his character and sentiments were maliciously misrepresented, since it appears, by the best and most authentic accounts, that he was much better acquainted with the true principles and doctrines of Christianity than BONIFACE himself; and hence he is considered by many as a confessor and sufferer for the truth in this barbarous age [k]. Be that as it will, both ADALBERT and CLEMENT were condemned, at the instigation of BONIFACE, by the pontif ZACHARY, in a council assembled at *Rome* A. D. 748 [l], and in consequence

[b] See the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 82.

[i] There is an edition of this letter published by the learned STEPHEN BALUZIUS, in the *Capitularia Regum Francorum*, tom. ii. p. 1396.

[k] We find an enumeration of the erroneous opinions of CLEMENT in the letters of BONIFACE *Epistol.* cxxxv. p. 189. See also USSERI *Sylloge Epistolarum Hibernicarum*, p. 12. *Nouveau Dictionnaire Hist. Critic.* tom. i. p. 133. The zealous BONIFACE was too ignorant to be a proper judge of heresy, as appears by his condemning VIRGILIUS for believing that there were antipodes. The great heresy of CLEMENT seems to have been his preferring the decisions of scripture to decrees of councils and the opinions of the fathers, which he took the liberty to reject when they were not conformable to the word of God.

[l] This is the true date of the council assembled by ZACHARY for the condemnation of ADALBERT and CLEMENT.

CENT. VIII. sequence thereof were committed to prison,
PART II. where, in all probability, they concluded their
days.

Felix and
Elipand.

III. Religious discord ran still higher in *Spain*, *France*, and *Germany*, towards the conclusion of this century; and the most unhappy tumults and commotions were occasioned by a question proposed to FELIX bishop of *Urgella*, by ELIPAND, archbishop of *Toledo*, who desired to know *in what sense* CHRIST was the son of God? The answer which the former gave to this question, was, that CHRIST, considered in his divine nature, was *truly* and *essentially* the son of God; but that, considered as a man, he was only so, *nominally* and *by adoption*. This doctrine was spread abroad by the two prelates; ELIPAND propagated it in the different provinces of *Spain*, and FELIX throughout *Septimania*, while the pontif ADRIAN, and the greatest part of the Latin doctors, looked upon this opinion as a renovation of the Nestorian heresy, by its representing CHRIST as divided into two distinct persons. In consequence of this, FELIX was successively condemned by the councils of *Narbonne*, *Ratisbon*, *Francfort* on the *Maine*, and *Rome*; and was finally obliged, by the council of *Aix la Chapelle*, to retract his error, and to change his opinion [*m*]. The change he made was, however, rather nominal than real, the

and not the year 745, as FLEURY* and MABILLON † have pretended, in which error they are followed by Mr. BOWER, in the third volume of his *History of the Popes*, p. 325. The truth is, that the letter of BONIFACE, in consequence of which this council was assembled, must have been wrote in the year 748; since he declares in that letter, that he had been near thirty years legate of the holy see of *Rome*, into which commission he entered, as all authors agree, about the year 719.

☞ [*m*] The council of *Narbonne* that condemned FELIX, was held in the year 788, that of *Ratisbon* in 792, that of *Francfort* in 794, that of *Rome* in 799.

* *Hist. Ecclesiast.* tom. ix. p. 296. † *Annal. Ord. Benedict.* lib. xxii. n. 8.

common shift of temporising divines; for he still retained his doctrine, and died in the firm belief of it at *Lyons*, where he had been banished by CHARLEMAGNE [n]. ELIPAND, on the contrary, lived secure in *Spain* under the dominion of the Saracens, far removed from the thunder of synods and councils, and out of the reach of that coercive power in religious matters, whose utmost efforts can go no further than to make the erroneous, hypocrites or martyrs. Many are of opinion, that the disciples of FELIX, who were called *Adoptians*, departed much less from the doctrine generally received among Christians, than is commonly imagined; and that what chiefly distinguished their tenets was the term they used, and their manner of expression, rather than a real diversity of sentiments [o]. But as this sect, together with their chief, thought proper to make use of singular, and sometimes of contradictory, expressions; this furnished such as accused them of Nestorianism, with very plausible reasons to support their charge.

[n] The authors, who have written concerning the sect of FELIX, are mentioned by J. ALB. FRIEDRICIUS, *Biblioth. Lat. medii ævi*, tom. ii. p. 482. Add to these PETRUS DE MARCA, in his *Marca Hispanica*, lib. iii. cap. xii. p. 368. JO. DE FERRERAS, *Histoire Generale d'Espagne*, tom. ii. p. 518. 523. 528. 535. 560. JO. MABILLON, *Præf. ad Sæc. iv. Aëtior. SS. Ord. Benedicti*, part ii. There are also very particular accounts given of FELIX by DOM. COLONIA, *Histoire Littéraire de la Ville de Lyon*, tom. ii. p. 70. and by the Benedictine monks, in their *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 434.

[o] JO. GEORGE DORSCHFUS, *Collat. ad Concilium Freisingensium*, p. 101. WERENFELS, *De Logomachis Eruditor.* p. 459 Opp. JAC. BASNAGIUS *Præf. ad Ethevium* in HENR. CANISII *Lection. antiquis*, tom. ii. part I. p. 284. GEORGIUS CALIXTUS, *Singul. Diff.*

T H E
N I N T H C E N T U R Y.
P A R T I.

The External HISTORY of the CHURCH.

C H A P T E R I.

*Concerning the prosperous events which happened to
the church during this century.*

C E N T.
IX.
P A R T I.

The
Swedes,
Danes, and
Cimbrians
converted.

I. **T**HE reign of CHARLEMAGNE had been singularly auspicious to the Christian cause; the life of that great prince was principally employed in the most zealous efforts to propagate and establish the religion of JESUS among the Huns, Saxons, Frieslanders, and other unenlightened nations; but his piety was mixed with violence, his spiritual conquests were generally made by the force of arms, and this impure mixture tarnishes the lustre of his noblest exploits. His son LEWIS, undeservedly surnamed the MEER, inherited the defects of his illustrious father without his virtues, and was his equal in violence and cruelty, but vastly his inferior in all worthy and valuable accomplishments. Under his reign a very favourable opportunity was offered of propagating the gospel among the northern nations, and particularly among the inhabitants of *Sweden* and *Denmark*. A petty king of *Jutland*, named HARALD KLACK, being driven from both his
kingdom

kingdom and country, in the year 826, by REGNER LODBROCK, threw himself at the emperor's feet, and implored his succours against the usurper. LEWIS granted his request, and promised the exiled prince his protection and assistance, on condition, however, that he would embrace Christianity, and admit the ministers of that religion to preach in his dominions. HARALD submitted to these conditions, was baptized with his brother at *Mentz*, A. D. 826, and returned into his country attended by two eminent divines, ANSGAR OF ANSCHAIRE and AUTHBERT; the former a monk of *Corbey* in *Westphalia*, and the latter belonging to a monastery of the same name in *France*. These venerable missionaries preached the gospel with remarkable success, during the space of two years, to the inhabitants of *Cimbria* and *Jutland*.

II. After the death of his learned and pious companion AUTHBERT, the zealous and indefatigable ANSGAR made a voyage into *Sweden*, A. D. 828, where his ministerial labours were also crowned with a distinguished success. As he returned from thence into *Germany* in the year 831, he was loaded by LEWIS the MEERK with ecclesiastical honours, being created archbishop of the new church at *Hamburgh*, and also of the whole north, to which dignity the superintendence of the church of *Bremen* was afterwards added in the year 844. The profits attached to this high and honourable charge were very inconsiderable; while the perils and labours, in which it involved the pious prelate, were truly formidable. Accordingly ANSGAR travelled frequently among the Danes, Cimbrians, and Swedes, in order to promote the cause of CHRIST, to form new churches, and to confirm and establish those which he had already gathered together; in all which arduous enterprises he passed his life in the most imminent

The promotion and labours of Ansgar.

C. E. N. T. dangers, until he concluded his glorious course
IX. A. D. 865 [a].
PART I.

Conversion
of the Bul-
garians, Bo-
hemians,
and Mora-
vians,

III. About the middle of this century the Mœsians [b], Bulgarians, and Gazarians, and after them the Bohemians and Moravians, were converted to Christianity by METIHODIUS and CYRIL, two Greek monks, whom the empress THEODORA had sent to dispel the darkness of these idolatrous nations [c]. The zeal of CHARLEMAGNE, and his pious missionaries, had been formerly exerted in the same cause, and among the same people [d], but with so little success, that any faint notions which they had received of the Christian doctrine were entirely effaced. The instructions of the Grecian doctors had a much better, and also a more permanent effect; but as they recommended to their new disciples the forms of worship, and the various rites and ceremonies used among the Greeks [e], this was the occasion of much religious animosity and conten-

[a] The writers to whom we are indebted for accounts of this pious and illustrious prelate, the founder of the Cimbrian, Danish, and Swedish churches, are mentioned by JO. ALBERT FABRICIUS, in his *Biblioth. Latin. mediæ ævi*, tom. i. p. 292; as also in his *Lux Evangelii orbi terrarum exortens*, p. 425. Add to these the Benedictine monks, in their *Histoire Litt. de la France*, tom. v. p. 277. *Acta Sanctor. Mens. Februar.* tom. i. p. 391. ERICI PONTOPPIDANI *Annales Eccles. Danicæ Diplomaticæ*, tom. i. p. 18. JO. MOILERUS, *Cimbriæ Litterata*, tom. iii. p. 8. These writers give us also circumstantial accounts of EBBOWITHMAR, RÆMBERT, and others, who were either the fellow labourers or successors of ANSGAR.

[b] We have translated thus the term *Myss*, which is an error in the original. Dr. MOSHEIM, like many others, has confounded the Mysians with the inhabitants of *Mæsia*, by giving the latter, who were Europeans, the title of the former, who dwelt in *Asia*.

[c] JO. GEORGE STREDOWSKY, *Sacra Moravia Historia*, lib. ii. cap. ii. p. 94. compared with PET. KOHLII *Introduc. in Historiam et rem Litt. Slavorum*, p. 124.

[d] STREDOWSKY, *loc. cit.* lib. i. cap. ix. p. 55.

[e] LENFANT, *Histoire de la guerre des Hussites*, livr. i. ch. i. p. 2.

tion

tion in after-times, when the lordly pontiffs exerted all their vehemence, and employed every means, though with imperfect success, of reducing these nations under the discipline and jurisdiction of the Latin church.

C E N T.
IX.
P A R T I.

IV. Under the reign of BASILIUS, the Macedonian, who ascended the imperial throne of the Greeks in year 867, the Slavonians, Arentani, and certain provinces of *Dalmatia*, sent a solemn embassy to *Constantinople* to declare their resolution of submitting to the jurisdiction of the Grecian empire, and of embracing, at the same time, the Christian religion. This proposal was received with admiration and joy, and it was also answered by a suitable ardour and zeal for the conversion of a people, which seemed so ingenuously disposed to embrace the truth: accordingly, a competent number of Grecian doctors were sent among them to instruct them in the knowledge of the gospel, and to admit them by baptism into the Christian church [f]. The warlike nation of the Russians were converted under the same emperor, but not in the same manner, nor from the same noble and rational motives. Having entered into a treaty of peace with that prince, they were engaged by various presents and promises to embrace the gospel, in consequence of which they received not only the Christian ministers that were appointed to instruct them, but also an archbishop, whom the Grecian patriarch IGNATIUS had sent among them, to perfect their conversion and establish their

Of the Slavonians and Russians.

[f] We are indebted for this account of the conversion of the Slavonians to the treatise *De administrando imperio*, composed by the learned emperor CONSTANTINE PORPHYROGEN, which is published by BANDURIUS in *Imperium Orientale*, tom. i. p. 72, 73. CONSTANTINE gives the same account of this event in the life of his grandfather BASILIUS the Macedonian, § 54, published in the *Corpus Byzantinum*, tom. xvi. p. 133, 134.

CENT.
IX.
PART I.

The nature
of these
conver-
sions.

church [g]. Such were the beginnings of Christianity among the bold and warlike Russians, who were inhabitants of the *Ukraine*, and who, a little before their conversion, fitted out a formidable fleet, and setting sail from *Kiovia* for *Constantinople*, spread terror and dismay through the whole empire [b].

V. It is proper to observe, with respect to the various conversions which we have now been relating, that they were undertaken upon much better principles, and executed in a more pious and rational manner, than those of the preceding ages. The ministers, who were now sent to instruct and convert the barbarous nations, employed not, like many of their predecessors, the terror of penal laws, to affright men into the profession of Christianity; nor, in establishing churches upon the ruins of idolatry, were they principally

[g] *CONSTANTINUS Porph. Vita Basilii Macedonis*, § 96. p. 157. *Cerp. Byzant.* See also the *Narratio de Ruthenorum Conversione*, published both in Greek and Latin by BANDURIUS, in his *Imperium Orientale, notis ad Porphyrogenetam de administrando imperio*, p. 62. tom. ii.

[b] The learned LEQUIN, in his *Oriens Christianus*, tom. i. p. 1257, gives a very inaccurate account of these Russians who were converted to Christianity under the reign of BASILIUS the Macedonian, and in this he does no more than adopt the errors of many who wrote before him upon the same subject. Nor is he consistent with himself; for in one place he affirms, that the people here spoken of were the Russians, that lived in the neighbourhood of the Bulgarians; while in another he maintains, that by these Russians, we are to understand the Gazarians. The only reason he alleges to support this latter opinion is, that among the Christian doctors sent to instruct the Russians, mention is made of CYRIL, who converted the Gazari to Christianity. This reason shews, that the learned writer had a most imperfect knowledge both of these Russians and the Gazari. He is also guilty of other mistakes upon the same subject. There is a much better explanation of this matter given by the very learned THEOPH. SIGIFRED. BAYER, *Dissert. de Russorum prima expeditione Constantinopolitana*, which is published in the sixth volume of the *Commentaria Acad. Scientiar. Petropolitana*.

attentive

attentive to promote the grandeur and extend the authority of the Roman pontifs: their views were more noble, and their conduct more suitable to the genius of the religion they professed. They had principally in view the happiness of mankind, endeavoured to promote the gospel of truth and peace by methods of a rational persuasion, and seconded their arguments by the victorious power of exemplary lives. It must, however, be confessed, that the doctrine they taught was far from being conformable to that pure and excellent rule of faith and practice laid down by our divine Saviour, and his holy apostles; their religious system was, on the contrary, corrupted with a variety of superstitious rites, and a multitude of absurd inventions. It is further certain, that there remained among these converted nations too many traces of the idolatrous religion of their ancestors, notwithstanding the zealous labours of their Christian guides; and it appears also, that these pious missionaries were contented with introducing an external profession of the true religion among their new proselytes. It would be, however, unjust to accuse them on this account of negligence or corruption in the discharge of their ministry, since, in order to gain over these fierce and savage nations to the church, it may have been absolutely necessary to indulge them in some of their infirmities and prejudices, and to connive at many things, which they could not approve, and which, in other circumstances, they would have been careful to correct.

C H A P. II.

Concerning the calamitous events that happened to the church during this century.

C E N T. I.
IX
P A R T I.

The progress of the Saracens towards universal empire.

THE Saracens had now extended their usurpations with an amazing success. Masters of *Asia*, a few provinces excepted, they pushed their conquests to the extremities of *India*, and obliged the greatest part of *Africa* to receive their yoke; nor were their enterprises in the west without effect, since *Spain* and *Sardinia* submitted to their arms, and fell under their dominion. But their conquests did not end here: for in the year 827, by the treason of EUPHEMIUS, they made themselves masters of the rich and fertile island of *Sicily*; and towards the conclusion of this century the Asiatic Saracens seized upon several cities of *Calabria*, and spread the terror of their victorious arms even to the very walls of *Rome*, while *Crete*, *Corfica*, and other adjacent islands, were either joined to their possessions, or laid waste by their incursions. It is easy to comprehend that this overgrown prosperity of a nation accustomed to bloodshed and rapine, and which also beheld the Christians with the utmost aversion, must have been every where detrimental to the progress of the gospel, and to the tranquillity of the church. In the east, more especially, a prodigious number of Christian families embraced the religion of their conquerors, that they might live in the peaceful enjoyment of their possessions. Many, indeed, refused this base and criminal compliance, and with a pious magnanimity adhered to their principles in the face of persecution; but such were gradually reduced to a miserable condition, and were not only robbed of the best part of their wealth, and deprived of their

their worldly advantages, but, what was still more deplorable, they fell by degrees into such incredible ignorance and stupidity, that, in process of time, there were scarcely any remains of Christianity to be found among them besides the mere name, and a few external rites and ceremonies. The European Saracens, particularly those who were settled in *Spain*, were of a much milder disposition, and seemed to have put off the greatest part of their native ferocity; so that the Christians, generally speaking, lived peaceably under their dominion, and were permitted to observe the laws, and to enjoy the privileges of their holy profession. It must, however, be confessed, that this mild and tolerating conduct of the Saracens was not without some few exceptions of cruelty [i].

II. The European Christians had the most cruel sufferings to undergo from another quarter, even from the insatiable fury of a swarm of barbarians that issued out from the northern provinces. The Normans, under which general term are comprehended the Danes, Norwegians, and Swedes, whose habitations lay along the coasts of the Baltic sea, were a people accustomed to carnage and rapine. Their petty kings and chiefs, who subsisted by piracy and plunder, had already, during the reign of CHARLEMAGNE, infested with their fleets the coasts of the German ocean, but were restrained by the opposition they met with from the vigilance and activity of that warlike prince. In this century, however, they became more bold and enterprising, made frequent irruptions into *Germany, Britain, Friesland, and the Gauls, and*

The Nor-
mans.

[i] See, for example, the account that is given of EUGENIUS, who suffered martyrdom at *Cordoua*, in the *Acta Sanctorum ad d. xi. Martii*, tom. ii. p. 88; as also of RODERICK and SALOMON, two Spanish martyrs of this century. *Ibid. ad d. xiii. Martii*, p. 238.

carried

CENT.
IX.
PART I.

carried along with them, wherever they went, fire and sword, desolation and horror. The impetuous fury of these savage barbarians not only spread desolation through the *Spanish* provinces [*k*], but even penetrated into the very heart of *Italy*; for in the year 857, they sacked and pillaged the city of *Luca* in the most cruel manner, and about three years after *Pisa*, and several other cities of *Italy*, met with the same fate [*l*]. The ancient histories of the Franks abound with the most dismal accounts of their horrid exploits.

Form new
settlements.

III. The first views of these savage invaders extended no further than plunder; but charmed at length with the beauty and fertility of the provinces, which they were so cruelly depopulating, they began to form settlements in them; nor were the European princes in a condition to oppose their usurpations. On the contrary, CHARLES the BALD was obliged, in the year 850, to resign a considerable part of his dominions to this powerful banditti [*m*]; and a few years after, under the reign of CHARLES the GROSS, emperor and king of *France*, the famous Norman chief GODFRED entered with an army into *Friesland*, and obstinately refused to sheath his sword before he

[*k*] JO. DE FERRERAS, *Histoire Gener. d'Espagne*, tom. ii. p. 583. Piracy was esteemed among the northern nations a very honourable and noble profession; and hence the sons of kings, and the young nobility, were trained up to this species of robbery, and made it their principal business to perfect themselves in it. Nor will this appear very surprising to such as consider the religion of these nations, and the barbarism of the times. See JO. LUD. HOLEFRG. *Historia Danorum et Norvegorum Navalis*, in *Scriptis Societatis Scientiar. Hafniensis*, tom. iii. p. 349. in which there are a multitude of curious and interesting relations concerning the ancient piracies, drawn from the Danish and Norwegian annals.

[*l*] See the *Scriptor. Rerum Italicarum*, published by MURATORI.

[*m*] *Annales incesti Auctoris*, in PITHOLI *Scriptor. Francie*, p. 46.

was master of the whole province [n]. Such, however, of the Normans as settled among the Christians, contracted a gentler turn of mind, and gradually departed from their primitive brutality. Their marriages with the Christians contributed, no doubt, to civilize them; and engaged them to abandon the superstition of their ancestors with more facility, and to embrace the gospel with more readiness, than they would have otherwise done. Thus the proud conqueror of *Friesland* solemnly embraced the Christian religion after that he had received in marriage, from CHARLES the GROSS, GISELA, the daughter of LOTHAIRE the younger.

[n] REGINONIS PRUMIENSIS *Annal.* lib. ii. f. 60, in PISTORIUS *Scriptor. German.*

P A R T II.

The INTERNAL HISTORY of the CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the state of letters and philosophy during this century.

CENT.
IX.
PART II.

The state of
letters
among the
Greeks.

THE Grecian empire, in this century, was in circumstances every way proper to extinguish all taste for letters and philosophy, and all zeal for the cultivation of the sciences. The liberality, however, of the emperors, some of whom were men of learning and taste, and the wise precautions taken by the Patriarchs of *Constantinople*, among whom *PHOTIUS* deserves the first rank in point of erudition, contributed to attach a certain number of learned men to that imperial city, and thus prevented the total decline of letters. Accordingly we find in *Constantinople*, at this time, several persons who excelled in eloquence and poetry; some who displayed, in their writings against the Latins, a considerable knowledge in the art of reasoning, and a high degree of dexterity in the management of controversy; and others who composed the history of their own times with accuracy and with elegance. The controversy with the Latins, when it grew more keen and animated, contributed in a particular manner to excite the literary emulation of the disputants, rendered them studious to acquire new ideas, and a rich and copious elocution, adorned with the graces of elegance and wit; and thus roused and invigorated talents that were ready to perish in indolence and sloth.

II. We

II. We learn from the accounts of ZONARAS, that the study of philosophy lay for a long time neglected in this age; but it was revived, with a zeal for the sciences in general, under the emperor THEOPHILUS, and his son MICHAEL III. This revival of letters was principally owing [o] to the encouragement and protection which the learned received from BARDAS, who had been declared CÆSAR, himself a weak and illiterate man, but a warm friend of the celebrated PHOTIUS, the great patron of science, by whose counsel he was, undoubtedly, directed in this matter. At the head of all the learned men to whom BARDAS committed the culture of the sciences, he placed LEO, surnamed the WISE, a man of the most profound and uncommon erudition, and who afterwards was consecrated bishop of *Theſſalonica*. PHOTIUS explained the *Categories* of ARISTOTLE, while MICHAEL PSELLUS gave a brief exposition of the other works of that great philosopher.

CENT.
IX.
PART II.
Of philosophy.

III. The Arabians, who, instead of cultivating the arts and sciences, had thought of nothing hitherto but of extending their territories, were now excited to literary pursuits by ALMAMUNIS, otherwise called ABU GAFFAR AEDALLAH, whose zeal for the advancement of letters was great, and whose munificence towards men of learning and genius was truly royal. Under the auspicious protection of this celebrated caliph of *Babylon* and *Egypt*, the Arabians made a rapid and astonishing progress in various kinds of learning. This excellent prince began to reign about the time of the death of CHARLEMAGNE, and died in the year 833. He erected the famous schools of *Bagdad*, *Cusa*, and *Basora*, and established seminaries of learning in several other cities; he drew to his court men of eminent parts by his extraordinary

The state
of learning
among the
Arabians.

[o] *Annalium*, tom. ii. lib. xvi. p. 126. tom. x. *Corporis Byzantin.*

CENT.
IX.
PART II.

liberality, set up noble libraries in various places, had translations made of the best Grecian productions into the Arabic language at a vast expence, and employed every method of promoting the cause of learning, that became a great and generous prince, whose zeal for the sciences was attended with knowledge [p]. It was under the reign of this immortal caliph, that the Arabians began to take pleasure in the Grecian learning, and to propagate it, by degrees, not only in *Syria* and *Africa*, but also in *Spain* and *Italy*; and from this period they give us a long catalogue of celebrated philosophers, physicians, astronomers, and mathematicians, who were ornaments to their nation through several succeeding ages [q]. And in this certainly they do not boast without reason; though we are not to consider, as literally true, all the wonderful and pompous things which the more modern writers of the Saracen history tell us of these illustrious philosophers.

After this period, the European Christians profited much by the Arabian learning, and were highly indebted to the Saracens for the improvement they made in the various sciences. For the mathematics, astronomy, physic, and philosophy, that were taught in *Europe* from the tenth century, were, for the most part, drawn from the Arabian schools that were established in *Spain* and *Italy*, or from the writings of the Arabian sages. And from hence the Saracens may, in one respect, be justly considered as the restorers of learning in *Europe*.

IV. In that part of *Europe*, that was subject to the dominion of the Franks, CHARLEMAGNE la-

The state of letters under Charlemagne, and his successors.

[p] ABULPHARAIUS, *Historia Dynastiar.* p. 246. GEORG. ELMACIN. *Hist. Saracen.* lib. ii. p. 139. BARTHOLO. HERBELOT, *Biblioth. Orient.* Article MAMUN, p. 545.

[q] See the treatise of LEO AFRICANUS, *De Medicis et Philosophis Arabibus*, published a second time by FABRICIUS, in the twelfth volume of his *Bibliotheca Græca*, p. 259.

boured

boured with incredible zeal and ardour for the advancement of useful learning, and animated his subjects to the culture of the sciences in all their various branches. So that, had his successors been disposed to follow his example, and capable of acting upon the noble plan he formed, the empire, in a little time, would have been entirely delivered from barbarism and ignorance. It is true, this great prince left in his family a certain spirit of emulation, which animated his immediate successors to imitate, in some measure, his zeal for the prosperity of the republic of letters. LEWIS the MEEK both formed and executed several designs that were extremely conducive to the progress of the arts and sciences [r]; and his zeal, in this respect, was surpassed by the ardour with which his son CHARLES the BALD exerted himself in the propagation of letters, and in exciting the emulation of the learned by the most alluring marks of his protection and favour. This great patron of the sciences drew the *litterati* to his court from all parts, took a particular delight in their conversation, multiplied and embellished the seminaries of learning, and protected, in a more especial manner, the Aulic school, of which mention has been formerly made, and which was first erected in the seventh century, in order to the education of the royal family, and the first nobility [s]. His brother LOTHAIRE endeavoured to revive in *Italy* the drooping sciences, and to restore them from that state of languor and decay into which the corruption and indolence of the clergy had permitted them to fall.

[r] See the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 583.

[s] HERMAN CONRINGII *Antiquit. Academicæ*, p. 370. CÆS. EG. DU BOULAY, *Hist. Acad. Paris.* tom. i. p. 178. LAUNOÛS, *De Scholis Caroli M.* cap. xi, xii. p. 47. *Histoire Littér. de la France*, tom. v. p. 483.

C E N T. For this purpose he erected schools in the eight
IX principal cities of *Italy*, A. D. 823 [t], but with
PART II. little success, since it appears that that country
was entirely destitute of men of learning and genius during the ninth century [u].

In *England* learning had a better fate under the auspicious protection of king ALFRED, who has acquired an immortal name, not only by the admirable progress he made in all kinds of elegant and useful knowledge [w], but also by the care he took to multiply men of letters and genius in his dominions, and to restore to the sciences, sacred and profane, the credit and lustre they so eminently deserve [x].

Impediments to the progress of learning.

V. But the infelicity of the times rendered the effects of all this zeal and all these projects for the advancement of learning much less considerable than might have otherwise been expected. The

[t] See the edict for that purpose among the *Capitularia* in MURATORI *Rerum Italicar.* tom. i. part II. p. 151.

[u] See MURATORI's *Antiq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. iii. p. 829.

[w] See ANT. WOOD, *Hist. et Antiquit. Academ. Oxoniens.* lib. i. p. 13. BOULAY, *Hist. Acad. Paris.* tom. i. p. 211. *General Dictionary*, at the article ALFRED. (This prince, among other pious and learned labours, translated the *Pastoral* of GREGORY I. BOETIUS, *De Consolatione*, and BEDE's *Ecclesiastical History*.)

[x] This excellent prince not only encouraged by his protection and liberality such of his own subjects as made any progress in the liberal arts and sciences, but invited over from foreign countries men of distinguished talents, whom he fixed in a seminary at *Oxford*, and, of consequence, may be looked upon as the founder of that noble university. JOHANNES SCOTUS ERIGENA, who had been in the service of CHARLES the BALD, and GRIMBALD, a monk of *St. Bertin* in *France*, were the most famous of those learned men who came from abroad; ASSERIUS, WEREFRID, PLEGMUND, DUNWUF, WULFSIG, and the abbot of *St. Neor's*, deserve the first rank among the English *Littrati*, who adorned the age of ALFRED. See COLLIER's *Ecclesiastical History*, vol. I. book iii. p. 165, 166, &c. RAPIN THOYRAS, in the reign of this illustrious monarch.

pro-

protectors and patrons of the learned were themselves learned; their authority was respectable, and their munificence was boundless; and yet the progress of science towards perfection was but slow, because the interruptions arising from the troubled state of *Europe* were frequent. The discords that arose between LEWIS the MEEK and his sons, which were succeeded by a rupture between the latter, retarded considerably the progress of letters in the empire; and the incursions and victories of the Normans, which afflicted *Europe* during the whole course of this century, were so fatal to the culture of the arts and sciences, that, in most of the European provinces, and even in *France*, there remained but a small number who truly deserved the title of learned men [y]. The wretched and incoherent fragments of erudition that yet remained among the clergy were confined to the monasteries, and to the episcopal schools; but the zeal of the monkish and priestly orders for the improvement of the mind, and the culture of the sciences, diminished in proportion as their revenues increased, so that their indolence and ignorance grew with their possessions.

VI. It must, however, be confessed, that several examples of learned men, whose zeal for the sciences was kindled by the encouragement and munificence of CHARLEMAGNE, shone forth with a distinguished lustre through the darkness of this barbarous age. Among these, the first rank is due to RABANUS MAURUS, whose fame was great through all *Germany* and *France*, and to whom the youth resorted, in prodigious numbers, from all parts, to receive his instructions in the liberal arts and sciences. The writers of history, whose works have deservedly preserved their

Examples
of learned
men who
flourished
in this cen-
tury.

[y] SERVATI LUP1 *Epistolæ* xxxiv. p. 69 CONRINGII *Antiq. Acad.* p. 322. *Histoire Litter. de la France*, tom. iv. p. 251.

C E N T. names from oblivion, are EGINHARD, FREULPH,
 IX. THEGAN, HAMO, ANASTASIUS, ADO, and others
 PART II. of less note. FLORUS, WALAFRIDUS STRABO,
 BERTHARIUS, and RABANUS, excelled in poetry.
 SMARAGDUS and BERTHARIUS were eminent for
 their skill in grammar and languages, as was also
 the celebrated RABANUS already mentioned, who
 acquired a very high degree of reputation by a learned
 and subtle treatise concerning the causes and the
 rise of languages. The Greek and Hebrew erudi-
 tion was cultivated with considerable success by
 WILLIAM, SERVATUS LUPUS, SCOTUS, and others.
 EGINHARD, AGOBARD, HINCMAR, and SERVA-
 TUS LUPUS, were much celebrated for the elo-
 quence which appeared both in their discourses
 and in their writings [2].

Johannes
 Scotus
 Erigena.

VII. The philosophy and logic that were taught
 in the European schools during this century,
 scarcely deserved such honourable titles, and
 were little better than an empty jargon. There
 were, however, to be found in various places,
 particularly among the Irish, men of acute parts,
 and extensive knowledge, who were perfectly well
 entitled to the appellation of philosophers. The
 chief of these was JOHANNES SCOTUS ERIGENA [a],
 a native of *Ireland*, the friend and companion of
 CHARLES the BALD, who delighted so much in
 his conversation as to honour him with a place at
 his table. SCOTUS was endowed with an excel-

[2] Such as are desirous of a more circumstantial
 account of these writers, and of their various pro-
 ductions, may consult the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*,
 tom. iv. p. 251 to 271. Or the more ample account given
 of them by the celebrated LE BEUF, in his *Etat des Sciences*
en France depuis CHARLEMAGNE jusqu'au Roi ROBERT, which
 is published in his *Recueil de divers écrits pour servir d'Eclair-*
cissement à l'Histoire de France, tom. ii. p. 1. Paris 1738, en
 8vo.

[a] ERIGENA signifies properly a native of *Ireland*, as
Fris, or *Ilin*, was the ancient name of that kingdom.

lent

lent and truly superior genius, and was considerably versed both in Greek and Latin erudition. He explained to his disciples the philosophy of ARISTOTLE, for which he was singularly well qualified by his thorough knowledge of the Greek language; but as his genius was too bold and aspiring to confine itself to the authority and decisions of the Stagirite, he pushed his philosophical researches yet farther, dared to think for himself, and ventured to pursue truth without any other guide than his own reason. We have yet extant of his composition, *Five books concerning the division of nature*, an intricate and subtile production, in which the causes and principles of all things are investigated with a considerable degree of sagacity, and in which also the precepts of Christianity are allegorically explained, yet in such a manner as to shew, that their ultimate end is the union of the soul with the Supreme Being. He was the first who blended the *scholastic theology* with the *mythic*, and formed them into one system. It has also been imagined, that he was far from rejecting the opinions of those who consider the union of *God* and *nature*, as similar to the union that subsists between the soul and the body, a notion much the same with that of many ancient philosophers, who looked upon the Deity as the soul of the world. But it may, perhaps, be alleged, and not without reason, that what SEOTUS said upon this subject amounted to no more than what the *Realists* [b], as they are called, maintained

CENT.
IX.
PART II.

☞ [b] The *Realists*, who followed the doctrine of ARISTOTLE with respect to *universal ideas*, were so called in opposition to the *Nominalists*, who embraced the hypothesis of ZENO and the Stoics upon that perplexed and intricate subject. ARISTOTLE held, against PLATO, that previous to, and independent on, matter, there were no *universal ideas* or *essences*; and that the ideas or exemplars, which the latter supposed to have existed in the divine mind, and to have been the *models*

C E N T.
IX.
PART II.

ed afterwards, though it must be allowed that he has expressed himself in a very perplexed and obscure manner [c]. This celebrated philosopher formed no particular sect, at least as far as is come to our knowledge; and this will be considered, by those who are acquainted with the spirit of the times he lived in, as a proof that his immense learning was accompanied with meekness and modesty.

About this time there lived a certain person named MACARIUS, a native of *Ireland*, who propagated in *France* that enormous error, which was afterwards adopted and professed by AVERROES, that one individual intelligence, one soul, performed the spiritual and rational functions in all the human race. This error was confuted by RATRAM, a famous monk of *Corbey* [d]. Before these writers flourished DUNGAL, a native of *Ireland* also, who left his country, and retired into a French monastery, where he lived during the reigns of CHARLEMAGNE and LEWIS the MEEK, and taught philosophy and astronomy with the greatest reputation [e]. HERIC, a monk of *Aux-*

of all created things, had been eternally impressed upon matter, and were coeval with, and inherent in, their objects. ZENO and his followers, departing both from the Platonic and Aristotelian systems, maintained that these pretended universals had neither form nor essence, and were no more than mere terms and nominal representations of their particular objects. The doctrine of ARISTOTLE prevailed until the eleventh century, when ROSCELINUS embraced the Stoical system, and founded the sect of the Nominalists, whose sentiments were propagated with great success by the famous ABELARD. These two sects differed considerably among themselves, and explained, or rather obscured, their respective tenets in a variety of ways.

[c] The work here alluded to was published at *Oxford*, by Mr. THOMAS GALE, in 1681. The learned HEUMAN has made several extracts from it, and given also an ample and learned account of SCOTUS, in his *Acts of the Philosophers*, written in *German*, tom. iii. p. 858.

[d] MABILLON, *Præf. ad Sæc. part II. Act. SS. Ord. Benedi.* § 156. p. 53.

[e] *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 493.

erre,

erre, made likewise an eminent figure among the learned of this age; he was a man of uncommon sagacity, was endowed with a great and aspiring genius, and is said, in many things, to have anticipated the famous DESCARTES in the manner of investigating truth [*f*].

C E N T.
IX.
PART II.

C H A P. II.

Concerning the doctors and ministers of the church, and its form of government during this century.

I. **T**HE impiety and licentiousness of the greatest part of the clergy arose, at this time, to an enormous height, and stand upon record, in the unanimous complaints of the most candid and impartial writers of this century [*g*]. In the east, tumult; discord, conspiracies, and treason, reigned uncontrouled, and all things were carried by violence and force. These abuses appeared in many things, but particularly in the election of the patriarchs of *Constantinople*. The favour of the court was become the only step to that high and important office; and as the patriarch's continuance in that eminent post depended upon such an uncertain and precarious foundation, nothing was more usual than to see a prelate pulled down from his episcopal throne by an imperial decree. In the western provinces, the bishops were become voluptuous and effeminate to a very high degree. They passed their lives amidst the splendour of courts, and the plea-

The corruption of the clergy.

[*f*] LE BEUF *Memoires pour l'Histoire d'Auxerre*, tom. ii. p. 481. *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. iv. *M. Junii ad d.* xxiv. p. 829. *Id.* ad d. xxxi. *Jul.* p. 249. For this philosopher has obtained a place among the saintly order.

[*g*] See AGORARDUS, *De privilegiis et jure Sacerdotii*, § 13. p. 137. tom. i. opp. ed. *Baluzii*.

C E N T.
IX.
P A R T II.

tures of a luxurious indolence, which corrupted their taste, extinguished their zeal, and rendered them incapable of performing the solemn duties of their function [b]; while the inferior clergy were sunk in licentiousness, minded nothing but sensual gratifications, and infected with the most heinous vices the flock, whom it was the very business of their ministry to preserve, or to deliver from the contagion of iniquity. Besides, the ignorance of the sacred order was, in many places, so deplorable, that few of them could either read or write; and still fewer were capable of expressing their wretched notions with any degree of method or perspicuity. Hence it happened, that when letters were to be penned, or any matter of consequence was to be committed to writing, they had commonly recourse to some person who was supposed to be endowed with superior abilities, as appears in the case of SERVATUS LUPUS [i].

The causes
of this
corruption.

II. Many circumstances concurred, particularly in the European nations, to produce and augment this corruption and licentiousness, so shameful in an order of men, who were set apart to exhibit examples of piety to the rest of the world. Among these we may reckon, as the chief sources of the evil under consideration, the calamities of the times, even the bloody and perpetual wars that were carried on between LEWIS the MEER and his family, the incursions and conquests of the barbarous nations, the gross and

[b] The reader will be convinced of this by consulting AGOARD, *passim*, and by looking over the laws enacted in the Latin councils for restraining the disorders of the clergy. See also SERVATUS LUPUS, *Epist.* xxxv. p. 73. 281. and STEPH. BALUZ. in *Adnot.* p. 378.

[i] See the works of SERVATUS LUPUS, *Epist.* xcvi, xcix. p. 126. 142. 148. as also his *Life*. See also RODOLPHI *Bituricensis Capitula ad clerum suum*, in BALUZII *Miscellaneis*, tom. vi. p. 139. 148.

incre-

incredible ignorance of the nobility, and the affluence and riches that flowed in upon the churches and religious seminaries from all quarters. Many other causes also contributed to dishonour the church, by introducing into it a corrupt ministry. A nobleman, who, through want of talents, activity, or courage, was rendered incapable of appearing with dignity in the cabinet, or with honour in the field, immediately turned his views towards the church, aimed at a distinguished place among its chiefs and rulers, and became, in consequence, a contagious example of stupidity and vice to the inferior clergy [k]. The patrons of churches, in whom resided the right of election, unwilling to submit their disorderly conduct to the keen censure of zealous and upright pastors, industriously looked for the most abject, ignorant and worthless ecclesiastics, to whom they committed the cure of souls [l]. But one of the circumstances, which contributed in a particular manner to render, at least, the higher clergy wicked and depraved, and to take off their minds from the duties of their station, was the obligation they were under of performing certain services to their sovereigns, in consequence of the possessions they derived from the royal bounty. The bishops and heads of monasteries held many lands and castles by a feudal tenure; and being thereby bound to furnish their princes with a certain number of soldiers in time of war, were obliged also to take the field themselves at the head of these troops [m],

[k] HINC MARUS, *Oper. Posterior. contra Godeschalum*, cap. xxxvi. tom. i. Opp. p. 318. SERVATUS LUPUS, *Epist.* lxxix. p. 120.

[l] AGOBARDUS, *De privilegiis et jure Sacerdotum*, cap. xi. p. 341. tom. i. Opp.

[m] STEPH. BALUZII *Appendix Actor. ad Servatum*, p. 508. MURATORI *Antiq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. ii. p. 446. MABILLON, *Annal. Benedic.* tom. vi. p. 587. FRESNE, *ad Joinville Hist. Ludovici S.* p. 75, 76.

CENT.
IX.
PART II.

and thus to act in a sphere that was utterly inconsistent with the nature and duties of their sacred character. Besides all this, it often happened that rapacious princes, in order to satisfy the craving wants of their soldiers and domestics, boldly invaded the possessions of the church, which they distributed among their armies; in consequence of which the priests and monks, in order to avoid perishing through hunger, abandoned themselves to the practice of violence, fraud, and all sorts of crimes, which they looked upon as the only means, they had left, of procuring themselves a subsistence [n].

The Roman
pontiffs.

III. The Roman pontiffs were raised to that high dignity by the suffrages of the sacerdotal order, accompanied by the voice of the people; but, after their election, the approbation of the emperor was necessary in order to their consecration [o]. There is indeed, yet extant, an edict, supposed to have been published in the year 817, by LEWIS the MEEK, in which he abolishes this imperial right, and grants to the Romans, not only the power of electing their pontiff, but also the privilege of installing and consecrating him when elected, without waiting for the consent of the emperor [p]. But this grant will deceive none who enquire into this matter with any degree of attention and diligence, since

[n] AGOËARDUS, *De dispens. rerum Ecclesiast.* § 4. p. 270. tom. i. Opp. FLODOARDUS, *Hist. Eccles. Rhemensis*, lib. iii. cap. ix. SERVATUS LUPUS, *Epist.* xlv. p. 87. 437, &c. MURATORI, tom. vi. *Antiq. Ital. medii ævi*, p. 302. LUD. THOMASSIN, *Disciplina Ecclesiæ vet. et novæ circa beneficia*, part II. lib. iii. cap. xi. These corrupt measures prevailed also among the Greeks and Lombards, as may be seen in the *Oriens Christianus* of LEQUIEN, tom. i. p. 142.

[o] See DE BUNAU, *Hist. Imper. German.* tom. iii. p. 28. 32.

[p] HARDUINI *Concilia*, tom. iv. p. 1236. LE COINTE, *Annales Eccles. Francor.* tom. vii. ad A. 817. § 6. BALUZII *Capitular. Regum Francor.* tom. i. p. 591.

several

several learned men have proved it spurious by the most irresistible arguments [q]. It must, however, be confessed, that, after the time of CHARLES the BALD, a new scene of things arose; and the important change above mentioned was really introduced. That prince having obtained the imperial dignity by the good offices of the bishop of *Rome*, returned this eminent service by delivering the succeeding pontiffs from the obligation of waiting for the consent of the emperors, in order to their being installed in their office. And thus we find, that from the time of EUGENIUS III. who was raised to the pontificate A. D. 884. the election of the bishops of *Rome* was carried on without the least regard to law, order, and decency, and was generally attended with civil tumults and dissensions, until the reign of OTHO the GREAT, who put a stop to these disorderly proceedings.

IV. Among the prelates that were raised to the pontificate, in this century, there were very few who distinguished themselves by their learning, prudence, and virtue, or who were at all careful about acquiring those particular qualities that are essential to the character of a Christian bishop. On the contrary, the greatest part of them are only known by the flagitious actions that have transmitted their names with infamy to our times; and they all, in general, seem to have vied with each other in their ambitious efforts to extend their authority, and render their dominion unlimited and universal. It is here that we may place, with propriety, an event, which is said to

The frauds practised by the Roman pontiffs to increase their power.

[q] MURATORI *Droits de l'Empire sur l'Etat Ecclesiast.* p. 54. and *Antiq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. iii. p. 29, 30. in which that learned man conjectures, that this edict was forged in the eleventh century. BUNAU, *Hist. Imper. German.* tom. iii. p. 34. The partisans, however, of the papal authority, such as Fontanani and others, plead strenuously, though ineffectually, for the authenticity of the edict in question.

have

CENT.
IX.
PART II.

have interrupted the much vaunted succession of regular bishops in the see of *Rome*, from the first foundation of that church to the present times. Between the pontificate of *LEO IV.* who died in the year 855, and that of *BENEDICT III.* a certain woman, who had the art to disguise her sex for a considerable time, is said, by learning, genius, and dexterity, to have made good her way to the papal chair, and to have governed the church with the title and dignity of pontif about two years. This extraordinary person is yet known by the title of *POPE JOAN*. During the five succeeding centuries this event was generally believed, and a vast number of writers bore testimony to its truth; nor, before the reformation undertaken by *LUTHER*, was it considered by any, either as incredible in itself, or as ignominious to the church [r]. But in the last century, the elevation, and indeed the existence, of this female pontif, became the subject of a keen and learned controversy; and several men of distinguished abilities both among the Roman catholics and protestants, employed all the force of their genius and erudition to destroy the credit of this story, by invalidating, on the one hand, the weight of the testimonies on which it is founded, and by shewing, on the other, that it was inconsistent with the most accurate chronological computations [s]. Between the contending parties, some of

[r] The arguments of those who maintain the truth of this extraordinary event are collected in one striking point of view, with great learning and industry, by *FRED. SPANHEIM*, in his *Exercitatio de Papa Fœmina*, tom. ii. Opp. p. 577. This dissertation was translated into French by the celebrated *L'ENFANT*, who digested it into a better method, and enriched it with several additions.

[s] The arguments of those who reject the story of *POPE JOAN* as a fable, have been collected by *DAVID BLONDEL*, and after him with still more art and erudition by *BAYLE*, in the

of the wisest and most learned writers have judiciously steered a middle course: they grant that many fictitious and fabulous circumstances have been interwoven with this story; but they deny that it is entirely destitute of all foundation, or that the controversy is yet ended, in a satisfactory manner, in favour of those who dispute the truth. And, indeed, upon a deliberate and impartial view of this whole matter, it will appear more than probable, that some unusual event must have happened at *Rome*, from which this story derived its origin; because it is not at all credible, from any principles of moral evidence, that an event should be universally believed and related in the same manner by a multitude of historians, during five centuries immediately succeeding its supposed date, if that event was absolutely destitute of all foundation. But what it was that gave rise to this story is yet to be discovered, and is likely to remain so [t].

CENT.
IX.
PART II.

V. The

the third volume of his *Dictionary*, at the article *PAPESSE*. Add to this JO. GEORG. ECCARD, *Histor. Franciæ Oriental.* tom. ii. lib. xxx. § 119. p. 436, which author has adopted and appropriated the sentiments of the great LEIBNITZ, upon the matter in question. See also LEQUIEN'S *Oriens Christian.* tom. iii. p. 777. and HEUMAN'S *Sylloge Dissert. Sacr.* tom. i. part II. p. 352. The very learned JO. CHRISTOPH. WAGENSELIUS has given a just and accurate view of the arguments on both sides, which may be seen in the *Amœnitates Litterariæ* of SCHELHORNII, part I. p. 146. and the same has been done by BASNAGE, in his *Histoire de l'Eglise*, tom. i. p. 408. A list of the other writers, who have employed their labours upon this intricate question, may be seen in CASP. SAGITTARIUS'S *Introd. in Hist. Eccles.* tom. i. cap. xxv. p. 676. and in the *Biblioth. Bremens.* tom. viii. part V. p. 935.

[t] Such is the opinion of PAUL SARPI, in his *Lettere Italiane*, Lett. lxxxii. p. 452; of LENFANT *Biblioth. Germanique*, tom. x. p. 27; of THEOD. HASÆUS, *Biblioth. Bremens.* tom. viii. part V. p. 935: and of the celebrated PFAFF *Instit. Hist. Eccles.* p. 402; to whom we might add WERNSDORFF, BOECLER, HOLBERG, and many others, were this enumeration

CENT.
IX.
PART II.

Their zealous attachment to the kings of France, by whom they are favoured.

V. The enormous vices, that must have covered so many pontiffs with infamy in the judgment of the wise, formed not the least obstacle to their ambition in these miserable times, nor hindered them from extending their influence, and augmenting their authority, both in church and state. It does not, indeed, appear from any authentic records, that their possessions augmented in proportion to the progress of their authority, nor that any new grants of land were added to what they had already obtained from the liberality of the kings of France. The donations, which LEWIS the MEEK is reported to have made to them, are mere inventions, equally destitute of truth and probability [u]; and nothing is more groundless than the accounts of those writers who affirm that CHARLES the BALD divested himself, in the year 875, of his right to the city of Rome, and its territory, in favour of the pontiffs, whom he, at the same time, enriched with a variety of noble and costly presents, in return for the good services of JOHN VIII. by whose succours he was raised to the empire. But be that as it may, it is certain, that the authority and affluence of the bishops of Rome increased greatly from the time of LEWIS the MEEK, but more especially from the accession of CHARLES the BALD to the imperial throne, as all the historical records of that period abundantly testify [w].

They gain by the troubles that arise in the empire.

VI. After the death of LEWIS II. a fierce and dreadful war broke out between the posterity of

ration necessary. Without assuming the character of a judge in this intricate controversy, concerning which so many false decisions have been pronounced, I shall only take the liberty to observe, that the matter in debate is as yet dubious, and has not, on either side, been represented in such a light as to bring conviction.

[u] See above, § 3.

[w] BUNAU *Histor. Imperii Rom. German.* tom. ii. p. 482.
JO. GEORGE ECCARD, *Histor. Franciæ Orient.* tom. ii. lib. xxxi. p. 606.

CHARLEMAGNE, among which there were several competitors for the empire. This furnished the Italian princes, and the Roman pontif JOHN VIII. with a favourable opportunity of assuming to themselves the right of nominating to the imperial throne, and of excluding from all part in this election the nations who had formerly the right of suffrage; and if the opportunity was favourable, it was seized with avidity, and improved with the utmost dexterity and zeal. Their favour and interest was earnestly solicited by CHARLES the BALD, whose intreaties were rendered effectual by rich presents, prodigious sums of money, and most pompous promises, in consequence of which he was proclaimed, A. D. 876, by the pontif JOHN VIII. and by the Italian princes assembled at *Pavia*, king of *Italy* and emperor of the Romans. CARLOMAN and CHARLES the GROSS, who succeeded him in the kingdom of *Italy*, and in the Roman empire, were also elected by the Roman pontif, and the Italian princes. After the reigns of these princes the empire was torn in pieces; the most deplorable tumults and commotions arose in *Italy*, *France*, and *Germany*, which were governed, or rather subdued and usurped, by various chiefs, and in this confused scene of things, the highest bidder was, by the succour of the greedy pontifs, generally raised to the government of *Italy*, and to the imperial throne [*].

VII. Thus the power and influence of the pontifs, in civil affairs, arose in a short time to an enormous height through the favour and protection of the princes, in whose cause they had employed the influence which superstition had given them over the minds of the people. The increase of their authority, in religious matters, was not

CENT.
IX.
PART II.

The emperors divested of their ecclesiastical authority, and the power of the councils and of the bishops diminished.

[*] This matter is amply illustrated by SIGONIUS, in his famous book *De Regno Italiae*, and by the other writers of German and Italian history.

CENT.
IX.
PART II.

less rapid, nor less considerable, and it arose from the same causes. The wisest and most impartial among the Roman Catholic writers not only acknowledge, but are even at pains to demonstrate, that, from the time of LEWIS the MEEK, the ancient rules of ecclesiastical government were gradually changed in *Europe* by the counsels and instigation of the court of *Rome*, and new laws substituted in their place. The European princes suffered themselves to be divested of the supreme authority in religious matters, which they had derived from CHARLEMAGNE; the power of the bishops was greatly diminished, and even the authority of both provincial and general councils began to decline. The Roman pontiffs, elated with their overgrown prosperity, and become arrogant, beyond measure, by the daily accessions that were made to their authority, were eagerly bent upon persuading all, and had, indeed, the good fortune to persuade many, that the bishop of *Rome* was constituted and appointed by JESUS CHRIST, supreme legislator and judge of the church universal; and that, therefore, the bishops derived all their authority from the Roman pontif, nor could the councils determine any thing without his permission and consent [y]. This opinion, which was inculcated by the pontiffs with the utmost zeal and ardour, was opposed by such as were acquainted with the ancient ecclesiastical constitutions, and the government of the church in the earlier ages; but it was opposed in vain.

[y] See the excellent work of an anonymous and unknown author, who signs himself D. B. and whose book is intitled *Histoire du Droit Ecclesiastique public Francois*, published first at *London*, in two volumes 8vo, in the year 1737, and lately republished in a larger and more splendid edition. The author of this performance shews, in a judicious and concise manner, the various steps by which the papal authority arose to such a monstrous height. His account of the ninth century may be seen in the first volume of his work, at the 160th page,

VIII. In order to gain credit to this new ecclesiastical system, so different from the ancient rules of church government, and to support the haughty pretensions of the pontiffs to supremacy and independence, it was necessary to produce the authority of ancient deeds, to stop the mouths of such as were disposed to set bounds to their usurpations. The bishops of *Rome* were aware of this ; and as those means were looked upon as the most lawful that tended best to the accomplishment of their purposes, they employed some of their most ingenious and zealous partizans in forging conventions, acts of councils, epistles, and such like records, by which it might appear, that, in the first ages of the church, the Roman pontiffs were cloathed with the same spiritual majesty and supreme authority which they now assumed [z]. Among these fictitious supports of the papal dignity, the famous *decretal Epistles*, as they are called, said to have been written by the pontiffs of the primitive times, deserve chiefly to be stigmatized. They were the production of an obscure writer, who fraudulently prefixed to them

C E N T.
IX.
P A R T II.

Forged memorials and acts procured by the pontiffs to establish their supremacy.

Decretals.

[z] There is just reason to imagine, that these *Decretals*, and various other acts, such as the grants of *CHARLEMAGNE* and *LEWIS the MEEK*, were forged with the knowledge and consent of the Roman pontiffs ; since it is utterly incredible, that these pontiffs should, for many ages, have constantly appealed, in support of their pretended rights and privileges, to acts and records that were only the fictions of private persons, and should, with such weak arms, have stood out against kings, princes, councils, and bishops, who were unwilling to receive their yoke. Acts of a private nature would have been useless here, and public deeds were necessary to accomplish the views of papal ambition. Such forgeries were, in this century, esteemed lawful, on account of their supposed tendency to promote the glory of God, and to advance the prosperity of the church : and, therefore, it is not surprizing, that the good pontiffs should feel no remorse in imposing upon the world frauds and forgeries, that were designed to enrich the patrimony of *St. PETER* ; and to aggrandize his successors in the apostolic see.

CENT.
IX.
PART II

the name of ISIDORE, bishop of *Seville* [*a*], to make the world believe they had been collected by that illustrious and learned prelate. Some of them had appeared in the eighth century [*b*], but they were now entirely drawn from their obscurity, and produced, with an air of ostentation and triumph, to demonstrate the supremacy of the Roman pontiffs [*c*]. The decisions of a certain Roman council, which is said to have been held during the pontificate of SYLVESTER, were likewise alleged in behalf of the same cause; but this council had never been so much as heard of before the present century, and the accounts now given of it proceeded from the same source with the *decretals*, and were equally authentic. Be that as it may, the decrees of this pretended council contributed much to enrich and aggrandize the

[*a*] It is certain that the forger of the *decretals* was extremely desirous of persuading the world, that they were collected by ISIDORE, the celebrated bishop of *Seville*, who lived in the sixth century. See FABRICII *Biblioth. Latin. medii ævi*, tom. v. p. 561. It was a custom among the bishops to add, from a principle of humility, the epithet *Peccator*, i. e. *Sinner*, to their titles; and, accordingly, the forger of the *Decretals* has added the word *Peccator* after the name of ISIDORE; but this some ignorant transcribers have absurdly changed into the word *Mercator*; and hence it happens, that one ISIDORUS MERCATOR passes for the fraudulent collector, or forger of the *decretals*.

[*b*] See DON CALMET, *Histoire de Lorraine*, tom. i. p. 528. B. JUST. HEN. BOHMER. *Præf. ad novum Edit. Juris Canon.* tom. i. pt. x. xix. *Not.*

[*c*] Beside the authors of the *Centuriæ Magdeburgenses* and other writers, the learned BLONDEL has demonstrated, in an ample and satisfactory manner, the spuriousness of the *decretals*, in his *Pseudo-Isidorus et Turrianus vapulantes*; and in our time the cheat is acknowledged even by the Roman Catholics, at least by such of them as are possessed of any tolerable degree of judgment and impartiality. See BUDDEUS's *Isagoge in Theologiam*, tom. ii. p. 762; as also PETR. COUSTANTIUS's *Prolegom. ad Epistolas Pontificum*, tom. i. p. 130; and a *Dissertation* of FLEURY, prefixed to the sixteenth volume of his *Ecclesiastical History*.

· Roman

Roman pontiffs, and exalt them above all human authority and jurisdiction [*d*].

C E N T.
IX.
P A R T II.

The success
of these
frauds.

IX. There were not, however, wanting among the Latin bishops men of prudence and sagacity, who saw through these impious frauds, and perceived the chains that were forging both for them and for the church. The French bishops distinguished themselves, in a particular and glorious manner, by the zeal and vehemence with which they opposed the spurious *decretals*, and other like fictitious monuments and records, and protested against their being received among the laws of the church. But the obstinacy of the pontiffs, and particularly of NICHOLAS I., conquered this opposition, and reduced it to silence. And as the empire, in the periods that succeeded this contest, fell back into the grossest ignorance and darkness, there scarcely remained any who were capable of detecting these odious impostors, or disposed to support the expiring liberty of the church. The history of the following ages shews, in a multitude of deplorable examples, the disorders and calamities that sprung from the ambition of the aspiring pontiffs; it represents these despotic lords of the church, labouring by the aid of their impious frauds to overturn its ancient government, to undermine the authority of its bishops, to engross its riches and revenues into their own hands; nay, what is still more horrible, it represents them aiming perfidious blows at the thrones of princes, and endeavouring to lessen their power, and to set bounds to their dominion. All this is unanimously acknowledged by such as have looked, with attention and impartiality, into the history of the times of which we now write, and is

[*d*] See Jo. LAUNOIUS, *De cura Ecclesiæ erga pauperes et miſeros*, cap. i. Observat. i. p. 576. tom. ii. part II. Opp.

C E N T.
IX.
P A R T II.

The monastic life in high repute.

ingenuously confessed by men of learning and probity, that are well affected to the Romish church and its sovereign pontif [e].

X. The monastic life was now universally in the highest esteem, and nothing could equal the veneration that was paid to such as devoted themselves to the sacred gloom and indolence of a convent. The Greeks and Orientals had been long accustomed to regard the monkish orders and discipline with the greatest admiration; but it was only since the beginning of the last century, that this holy passion was indulged among the Latins to such an extravagant length. In the present age it went beyond all bounds: kings, dukes, and counts, forgot their true dignity, even the fulfilling with zeal the duties of their high stations, and affected that contempt of the world and its grandeur, which they took for magnanimity, though it was really nothing else but the result of a narrow and superstitious spirit. They abandoned their thrones, their honours, and their treasures, and shut themselves up in monasteries with a view of devoting themselves entirely to God. Several examples of this fanatical extravagance were exhibited in *Italy, France, Germany, and Spain*, both in this and the preceding century. And if the allurements of worldly pleasures and honours had too much power over the minds of many, to permit their separating themselves from human society, during their lives, such endeavoured to make amends for this in their last hours; for when they perceived death approaching, they demanded the monastic habit, and actually put it on before their departure, that they

[e] See the abovementioned author's treatise, intitled *Regia Potestas in Causis Matrimonial.* tom. i. part II. Opp. p. 764; as also PERR. COUSTANTIUS, *Pref. ad Epist. Romanor. Pontif.* tom. i. p. 127.

might be regarded as of the fraternity, and be of consequence entitled to the fervent prayers and other spiritual succours of their ghostly brethren.

But nothing affords such a striking and remarkable proof of the excessive and fanatical veneration that was paid to the Monastic order, as the treatment they received from several kings and emperors, who drew numbers of monks and abbots from their cloisters, and placed them in stations entirely foreign to their vows and their character, even amidst the splendour of a court, and at the head of affairs. The transition, indeed, was violent from the obscurity of a convent and the study of a liturgy, to sit at the helm of an empire, and manage the political interests of nations. But such was the case; and pious princes alleged as a reason for this singular choice, that the government of a state could never be better placed than in the hands of such holy men, who had subdued all irregular appetites and passions, and were so divested of the lust of pleasure and ambition, as to be incapable of any unworthy designs, any low, sordid, or selfish views. Hence we find in the history of these times frequent examples of monks and abbots performing the functions of ambassadors, envoys, and ministers of state, and displaying their talents with various success in these high and eminent stations.

XI. The morals, however, of the monks, were far from being so pure as to justify the reason alleged above for their promotion. Their patrons and protectors, who loaded them with honours and preferment, were sensible of the irregular and licentious lives that many of them led, and used their utmost efforts to correct their vices, and to reform their manners. LEWIS the MEER distinguished his zeal in the execution of this virtuous and noble design; and, to render it more effectual, he employed the pious labours of BENE-

C E N T.
IX.
P A R T II.

Monks and abbots employed in civil affairs, and called to the courts of princes.

A reformation of the monastic order attempted.

C E N T.
IX.
P A R T II.

DICT, abbot of *Aniane*, in reforming the monasteries first in *Aquitaine*, and afterwards throughout the whole kingdom of *France*, and in restoring, by new and salutary laws, the monastic discipline, which was absolutely neglected and fallen into decay. This worthy ecclesiastic presided, in the year 817, in the council of *Aix la-Chapelle*, where several wise measures were taken for removing the disorders that reigned in the cloisters; and in consequence of the unlimited authority he had received from the emperor, he subjected all the monks, without exception, to the rule of the famous BENEDICT abbot of *Mount Cassin*, annulled that variety of rites and customs that had obtained in the different monasteries, prescribed to them all one uniform method of living, and thus united, as it were, into one general body or society, the various orders which had hitherto been connected by no common bond [*f*]. This admirable discipline, which acquired to BENEDICT of *Aniane* the highest reputation, and made him be revered as the second father of the western monks, flourished during a certain time, but afterwards declined through various causes, until the conclusion of this century, when, under the calamities that oppressed both the church and the empire, it almost entirely disappeared.

Canons and
canonesses.

XII. The same emperor, who had appeared with such zeal both in protecting and reforming the monks, gave also distinguished marks of his favour to the order of *canons*, which CHRODEGANGUS had introduced in several places during

[*f*] JO. MABILLON, *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Benedict. Sæc. iv.* part I. *Præf.* p. xxvii. and *Præf. ad Sæc. v.* p. xxv. EJUSDEM, *Annales Ordin. S. Benedict.* tom. ii. 430. CALMET, *Hist. de Lorraine*, tom. i. p. 596. For a particular account of BENEDICT of *Aniane*, and his illustrious virtues, see the *Acta Sanctor.* tom. ii. *Febr.* p. 606: and the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 447.

the last century. He distributed them through all the provinces of the empire, and instituted also an order of *canonesses*, which was the first female convent known in the Christian world [g]. For each of these orders the zealous emperor had a rule drawn up A. D. 817, in the council of *Aix-la-Chapelle*, which he substituted in the place of that which had been appointed by CHRODEGANUS, and this new rule was observed in most of the monasteries and convents of the canons and canonesses in the west until the twelfth century, notwithstanding that it was disapproved of by the court of *Rome* [h]. The author of the rule that was appointed for the *canons* was, undoubtedly, AMALARIUS, a presbyter of *Metz*; but it is not so certain whether that which was drawn up for the *canonesses* was composed by the same hand [i]. Be that as it may, the *canonical* order grew into

[g] See MABILLON, *Annal. Ordin. S. Benedicti*, tom. ii. p. 428.

[h] This rule was condemned in a council held at *Rome*, A. D. 1059, under the pontif NICHOLAS II. The pretexts used by the pontif and the assembled prelates, to justify their disapprobation of this rule, were, that it permitted the canons to enjoy the possessions they had before their vows, and allowed to each of them too large a portion of bread and wine; but the true reason was, that this order had been instituted by an emperor without either the consent, or knowledge, of the Roman pontif. For an account of the rule and discipline of these *canons*, see FLEURY'S *Eccles. Hist.* tom. x. p. 163, 164, &c. *Brussels* edition in 12mo.

[i] LUD. THOMASSIN, *Disciplin. Eccles. Vet. et Novæ*, part 1. lib. iii. cap. xlii, xliii. MURATORI *Antiq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. v. p. 186. 540. No accounts of the *Canons* are less worthy of credit, than those that are given by writers, who have been themselves members of that order, such as RAYMOND CHAPPONEL'S *Histoire des Chanoines*, published at *Paris* in 2vo. in the year 1699; for these writers, from fond prejudices in favour of their institution, and an ambitious desire of enhancing its merit and rendering it respectable, derive the origin of *canonical order* from CHRIST and his apostles, or trace it up, at least, to the first ages of the Christian church.

CENT.
IX.
PART II.

The principal
Greek
writers.

high repute; and from this time a great number of convents were erected for them through all the western provinces, and were richly endowed by the liberality of pious and opulent Christians. But this institution degenerated in a short time, like all others, from its primitive purity, and ceased to answer the laudable intention and design of its worthy founders [k].

XIII. Of the theological writers that flourished among the Greeks, the following are the most remarkable:

PHOTIUS, patriarch of *Constantinople*, a man of most profound and universal erudition, whose *Bibliotheca* [l], *Epistles*, and other writings, are yet valuable on many accounts.

NICEPHORUS, also a patriarch of the above mentioned city, who, among other productions, published a warm defence of the worship of images against the enemies of that idolatrous service [m].

THEODORUS STUDITES, who acquired a name chiefly by his warm opposition to the *Iconoclasts*, and by the zeal with which he wrote in favour of image worship [n].

The same cause has principally contributed to transmit to after-ages the names of THEODORUS GRAPTUS, METHODIUS, who obtained the title of *Confessor* for his adherence to image-worship in

[k] CALMET, *Hist. de Lorraine*, tom. i. p. 591. *Hist. Litteraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 536.

[l] See CAMUSAT, *Histoire des Journaux*, tom. i. p. 87.

[m]. *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. ii. *Martii ad d. xiii.* p. 293. OUDINUS, *Scriptor. Eccles.* tom. ii. p. 2.

[n] THEODORE STUDITES was one of the most voluminous writers of this century, and would certainly have been known as a man of genius and learning in after-ages, though the controversy concerning images had never existed. There are of his writings, yet extant, 265 letters, several treatises against the *Iconoclasts*, 124 epigrams in lambics, and a large manuscript, which contains a course of catechetical instruction concerning the duties of the monastic life.

the very face of persecution, THEODORUS ABUCARA [o], PETRUS SICULUS, NICETAS DAVID, and others, who would probably have been long since buried in oblivion, had not the various contests between the Greek and Latin churches, and the divisions of the former among themselves upon the question concerning images, excited the vehemence of these inconsiderable writers, and furnished them with an occasion of making some noise in the world.

MOSES BARCEPHA, a Syrian bishop, surpassed by far all whom we have now been mentioning, and deserved the shining reputation which he has obtained in the republic of letters, as what we have yet extant of his works discover several marks of true genius, and an uncommon acquaintance with the art of writing [p].

XIV. RABANUS MAURUS, archbishop of *Mentz*,^{Latin writers,} is deservedly placed at the head of the Latin writers of this age; the force of his genius, the extent of his knowledge, and the multitude of productions that flowed from his pen, entitle him to this distinguished rank, and render improper all comparison between him and his contemporaries. He may be called the great light of *Germany* and *France*, since it was from the prodigious fund of knowledge he possessed, that these nations derived principally their religious instruction. His writings were every where in the hands of the learned [q], and were held in such veneration, that, during four centuries, the most eminent of the Latin divines appealed to them as authority in

[o] See BAYLE's *Dictionary*, vol. i. at the article ABUCARA.

[p] JOS. SIM. ASSERMANNI *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. ii. p. 127.

[q] See, for a particular account of the life and writings of RABANUS MAURUS, the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. v. p. 151; as also the *Acta Sanctor.* tom. i. Febr. p. 500.

religious matters, and adopted almost universally the sentiments they contained. After this illustrious prelate, the writers that are most worthy of mention are,

AGOBARD, archbishop of *Lyons*, a man of wisdom and prudence, and far from being destitute of literary merit; but whose reputation has deservedly suffered by his justifying and even fomenting the rebellion of *LOTHAIRE* and *PEPIN* against *LEWIS* the MEEK, their father and their sovereign [r].

HILDUIN, abbot of *St. Dennis*, who acquired no small reputation by a work entitled, *Aeopagistica* [s].

EGINHARD, abbot of *Selingestat*, the celebrated author of the *Life of Charlemagne*, remarkable for the beauty of his diction, the perspicuity and elegance of his style, and a variety of other literary accomplishments [t].

CLAUDIUS, bishop of *Turin*, whose *Exposition* of several books of scripture [u], as also his *Chronology*, gained him an eminent and lasting reputation [w].

[r] See *COLONIA*, *Hist. Litter. de la ville de Lyon*, tom. ii. p. 93. *General Dictionary*, at the article *AGOBARD*. *Hist. Littéraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 567. [AGOBARD opposed with great zeal both the worship and the use of images in his famous book *De picturis et imaginibus*, a work which has greatly embarrassed the doctors of the Romish church.]

[s] *Hist. Littéraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 607.

[t] *Hist. Littéraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 550. See also the *Life of Charlemagne*, of which the best of fourteen editions is that published by *SCHMINKIUS*, at *Utrecht*, in the year 1711.

[u] This prelate, who was famous for his knowledge of the holy scriptures, composed 111 books of commentaries upon *Genesis*, 19 upon *Exodus*, and several upon *Leviticus*. He wrote also a commentary upon the *Gospel of St. Matthew*, in which there are many excellent things, and an exposition of all the *Epistles of St. Paul*. His commentary on the *Epistle to the Galatians* is printed, but all the rest are in manuscript.]

[w] See *SIMON*, *Critique de la Biblioth. Eccles. de M. Du Pin*, tom. i. p. 284.

FRECULF, bishop of *Lyseux*, whose *Chronicle*, which is no more than a heavy compilation, is yet extant.

CENT.
IX.
PART II.

SERVATUS LUPUS, of whose composition we have several epistles and treatises; and who, though a copious and subtle writer, is yet defective in point of elegance and erudition [x].

DREPANIUS FLORUS, who left behind him several *Poems An exposition of certain books of scripture*, and other performances less worthy of attention [y].

CHRISTIAN DRUTHMAR, the author of *A commentary upon St. Matthew's Gospel* [z].

GODESCHALC, a monk of *Orbais*, who rendered his name immortal by the controversy which he set on foot concerning *Predestination and Free Grace*.

PASCHASIUS RADBERT [a], a name famous in the contests concerning *The real presence of Christ's body in the Eucharist*; and who, to pass in silence his other writings, composed a book upon this very subject, which furnished abundant matter of dispute throughout this century.

BERTRAMN, or RATRAMN, a monk of *Corby*, who deserves the first rank among the writers that refuted the doctrine of RADBERT; and whose book concerning *The sacrament of the Lord's supper*, which was composed by the order of CHARLES the BALD, gave also occasion to many contests among learned divines [b].

HAYMO, bishop of *Halberstadt*, the laborious author of several treatises upon various subjects,

[x] *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. v. p. 255.

[y] COLONIA, *Histoire Littéraire de Lyon*, tom. ii. p. 135. *Hist. Littéraire de la France*, tom. v. p. 213.

[z] *Hist. Littéraire de la France*, tom. v. p. 84.

[a] For an account of RADBERT, see the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. v. p. 287.

[b] We shall have occasion to speak more particularly of BERTRAMN, and his book, in the following chapter.

and

C E N T. and who is more to be esteemed for his industry
IX. and diligence, than for his genius and learn-
PART II. ing [c].

WALAFRIDUS STRABO, who acquired no mean reputation by his *Poems*, his *Lives of the Saints*, and his *Explications* of many of the more difficult passages of scripture [d].

HINCMAR, archbishop of *Rheims*, a man of an imperious and turbulent spirit; but who deserves, notwithstanding, a distinguished place among the Latin writers of this century, since his works discover an aspiring genius, and an ardent zeal in the pursuit of truth, and tend, moreover, in a singular manner, to throw light both upon the civil and ecclesiastical history of the age in which he lived [e].

JOHANNES SCOTUS ERIGENA, the friend and companion of CHARLES the BALD, an eminent philosopher, and a learned divine, whose erudition was accompanied with uncommon marks of sagacity and genius, and whose various performances, as well as his translations from the Greek, gained him a shining and lasting reputation [f].

It is sufficient barely to name REMIGIUS BERTHARIUS, ADO, AIMOIN HERIC, REGINO, abbot of *Prum*, and others, of whom the most common writers of ecclesiastical history give ample accounts.

[c] It is proper to observe, that a great part of the writings that are attributed to HAYMO, bishop of *Halberstadt*, were composed by REMI, or REMIGIUS, of *Auxerre*. See CASSIMIR OUDINUS, *Comment. de Scriptor. Eccles.* tom. ii. p. 330. *Histoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. v. p. 111. tom. vi. p. 106. LE BEUF, *Recueil de Diss. sur l'Histoire de la France*, tom. i. p. 278.

[d] See the *Histoire Litter. de la France*, tom. v. p. 544.

[e] *Ibid.* tom. v. p. 416.

[f] See HERM. CONRINGIUS, *Antiq. Academica*, p. 309. *Hist. Litter. de la France*, tom. v. p. 416.

C H A P. III.

*Concerning the doctrine of the Christian church
during this century.*

I. **T**HE zeal of CHARLEMAGNE for the interests of Christianity, and his liberality to the learned, encouraged many to apply themselves diligently to the study of the scriptures, and to the pursuit of religious truth; and as long as this eminent set of divines remained, the western provinces were happily preserved from many errors, and from a variety of superstitious practices. Thus we find among the writers of this age several men of eminent talents, whose productions shew that the lustre of true erudition and theology was not, as yet, totally eclipsed. But these illustrious luminaries of the church disappeared one after the other, and barbarism and ignorance, encouraged by their departure, resumed their ancient seats, and brought, in their train, a prodigious multitude of devout follies, odious superstitions, and abominable errors. Nor did any encourage and propagate with more zeal and ardor these superstitious innovations, than the sacerdotal orders, the spiritual guides of a deluded people. And if we enquire how it came to pass, that the clergy were so zealous in such an inglorious cause, we shall find that this zeal was, in some, the effect of ignorance, and, in others, the fruit of avarice and ambition; since much was to be gained both in point of authority and opulence from the progress of superstition. Christianity among the Greeks and Orientals was almost in the same declining and deplorable state; though there arose, from time to time, in the eastern provinces, men of superior abilities, who endeavoured

CENT.
IX.
PART II.

The miserable state
of Christianity.

CENT.
IX.
PART II.

The causes
to which it
was owing.

voured to support the cause of true religion, and to raise it from the pressures under which it laboured.

II. The causes of this unhappy revolution, that covered the Christian church with superstition and darkness, will appear evident to such as are at all acquainted with the history of these times. The Oriental doctors, miserably divided among themselves, and involved in the bitterest contentions and quarrels with the western churches, lost all notion of the true spirit and genius of Christianity, and, corrupted and biased by the prejudices and passions that are generally excited and nourished by ill-managed controversy, became incapable of promoting the true and essential interests of religion. Intent also upon defending the excellence and divine authority of their doctrine and discipline against the Latin doctors, and in maintaining among themselves the worship of images, which began to be warmly opposed, they advanced many things in the course of these disputes that were highly erroneous, and as one error follows another, their number increased from day to day. The savage and unnatural lives of the monks and hermits, whose number was prodigious, and whose authority was considerable, who haunted the woods and deserts, the gloomy scenes of their extravagant devotion, contributed much, among other causes, to the decay of solid and rational piety. Add to all this, the irruptions of the barbarous nations into the west, the atrocious exploits of usurping princes, the drooping and neglected condition of all the various branches of learning, the ambitious frenzy of the Roman pontiffs, who were incessantly gaping after new accessions of authority and dominion, the frauds and tricks of the monastic orders carried on under the specious mask of religion, and then we shall

see the true causes that founded the empire of superstition and error upon the ruin of virtue, piety, and reason.

C E N T.
IX.
P A R T II.

III. The ignorance and corruption that dishonoured the Christian church, in this century, were great beyond measure; and were there no other examples of their enormity upon record, than the single instance of that stupid veneration that was paid to the bones and carcases of departed saints; this would be sufficient to convince us of the deplorable progress of superstition. This idolatrous devotion was now considered as the most sacred and momentous branch of religion, nor did any dare to entertain the smallest hopes of finding the Deity propitious, before they had assured themselves of the protection and intercession of some one or other of the saintly order. Hence it was that every church, and indeed every private Christian, had their particular patron among the saints, from an apprehension that their spiritual interests would be but indifferently managed by those, who were already employed about the souls of others; for they judged, in this respect, of the saints as they did of mortals, whose capacity is too limited to comprehend a vast variety of objects. This notion rendered it necessary to multiply prodigiously the number of the saints, and to create daily new patrons for the deluded people; and this was done with the utmost zeal. The priests and monks set their invention at work, and peopled, at discretion, the invisible world with imaginary protectors. They dispelled the thick darkness which covered the pretended spiritual exploits of many holy men; and they invented both names and histories of saints [g] that never existed, that they might not be at a loss to fur-

The corrupt ignorance and superstition that reigned in this century, appear even in the single instance of the foolish veneration that was paid to the saints and their relics

[(g) See Dr. MIDDLETON'S Letter from *Rome*, *passim*. in which we find the names of St. BACCHO, St. VIAR, St. AMPHIBOLUS, EVODIA, &c.]

C E N T. with the credulous and wretched multitude with
PART II. objects proper to perpetuate their superstition and
 to nourish their confidence. Many chose their
 own guides, and committed their spiritual interests either to phantoms of their own creation, or to distracted fanatics, whom they esteemed as saints, for no other reason than their having lived like madmen.

The saints
 canonized.

IV. The ecclesiastical councils found it necessary, at length, to set limits to the licentious superstition of those ignorant wretches, who, with a view to have still more friends at court, for such were their gross notions of things, were daily adding new saints to the list of their celestial mediators. They, accordingly, declared by a solemn decree, that no departed Christian should be considered as a member of the saintly order before the bishop in a provincial council, and in presence of the people, had pronounced him worthy of that distinguished honour [b]. This remedy, feeble and illusory as it was, contributed, in some measure, to restrain the fanatical temerity of the saint-makers; but, in its consequences, it was the occasion of a new accession of power to the Roman pontif. Even so early as this century many were of opinion, that it was proper and expedient, though not absolutely necessary, that the decisions of bishops and councils should be confirmed by the consent and authority of the Roman pontif, whom they considered as the supreme and universal bishop; and this will not appear surprising to any who reflect upon the enormous strides which the bishops of *Rome* made towards unbounded dominion in this barbarous

[b] MABILLON, *Act. Sanctor. Ord. Benedicti, Sæc. v. Pref.* p. 44. LAUNOY, *De Lazari, Magdalenæ, et Marthæ in Provinciam appulsi*, cap. i. § 12. p. 342. tom. ii. part I. opp. FRANC. PAGI *Breviarium Pontif. Romanor.* tom. ii. p. 259. tom. iii. p. 30.

and

and superstitious age, whose corruption and darkness were peculiarly favourable to their ambitious pretensions. It is true, we have no example of any person solemnly sainted by the bishop of Rome alone, before the tenth century [i], when UPALRIC, bishop of *Augsborg*, received this dignity in a formal manner from JOHN XV. It is however certain, that before that time the Roman pontiffs were consulted in matters of that nature, and their judgment respected in the choice of those that were to be honoured with saintship [k]; and it was by such steps as these, that the church of Rome engrossed to itself the creation of these tutelary divinities, which at length was distinguished by the title of *Canonization*.

V. This preposterous multiplication of saints was a new source of abuses and frauds. It was thought necessary to write the lives of these celestial patrons, in order to procure for them the veneration and confidence of a deluded multitude; and here lying wonders were invented, and all the resources of forgery and fable exhausted, to celebrate exploits which had never been performed, and to perpetuate the memory of holy persons who had never existed. We have yet extant a prodigious quantity of these trifling legends, the greatest part of which were, undoubtedly, forged after the time of CHARLEMAGNE by the monastic writers, who had both

Lives of the
saints.

[i] See DAN. PAFEBROCHIUS, *De solenn. um canonisationum initus et progress. in Propylæo Actor. SS. mens. Maii*, p. 171; and the other authors who have written upon this subject, of which there is an ample list in the *Bibliographia Antiquar. of FABRICIUS*, cap. vii. § 25. p. 270.

[k] See the candid and impartial account that is given of this matter by the late pope BENEDICT XIV., in his laborious work, *De servorum Dei beatificatione et beatorum canonizatione*, lib. i. cap. vii. p. 50. tom. i. opp. edit. *Roman*. It were to be wished, that historians of the church of Rome would learn to imitate the prudence, moderation, and equity of that illustrious pontiff.

C F E N T.
IX
PART II.

the inclination and leisure to edify the church by these pious frauds. The same impostors, who peopled the celestial regions with fictitious saints, employed also their fruitful inventions in embellishing with false miracles, and various other impertinent forgeries, the history of those, who had been really martyrs or confessors in the cause of CHRIST; these fictions, however, did not pass with impunity, but were severely censured by some of the most eminent writers of the times in which they were imposed upon the credulity of the public [1]. Various were the motives that engaged different persons to propagate, or countenance, these impostures. Some were excited to this by the seductions of a false devotion, which reigned in this perverse and ignorant age, and made them imagine that departed saints were highly delighted with the applauses and veneration of mortals, and never failed to crown with peculiar marks of their favour and protection such as were zealous in honouring their memories, and in celebrating their exploits. The prospect of gain and the ambitious desire of being revered by the multitude, engaged others to multiply the number, and to maintain the credit of the legends, or saintly registers. For the churches, that were dedicated to the saints, were perpetually crowded with supplicants, who flocked to them with rich presents, in order to obtain succour

[1] See SERVATUS LUPUS's *Vita Maximini*, p. 275, 276. and the candid and learned observations upon this subject that are to be found in various places of the work of the celebrated L. LAUNOY: e. g. in his *Dispositio Epistolæ Petri de Marca, ætate quo in Gallia Chr. sui fides recepta*, cap. xiv. p. 110. in his *Dissertationes de primis Christianæ relig. in Gallia introductis*, tom. ii. p. 142, 144, 145, 147, 163, 169, 181.—*De Lazari, Magdal. et Mariæ in Guilham appaitione*, p. 340.—*De Duobus Dionysis*, p. 527, 529, 530. tom. ii. part i. opp.—See also MARTINE *Théaurus Anecdotes*, tom. i. p. 151.—*Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 273.

under the afflictions they suffered; or deliverance from the dangers which they had reason to apprehend. And it was esteemed also a high honour to be the more immediate ministers of these tutelary mediators, who, as it is likewise proper to observe, were esteemed and frequented in proportion to their antiquity, and to the number and importance of the pretended miracles that had rendered their lives illustrious. This latter circumstance offered a strong temptation to such as were employed by the various churches in writing the lives of their tutelar saints, to supply by invention the defects of truth, and to embellish their legends with fictitious prodigies; nay, they were not only tempted to this imposture, but were even obliged to make use of it in order to swell the fame of their respective patrons [m].

VI. But even all this was insufficient to satisfy the demands of superstition, nourished by the stratagems of a corrupt and designing priesthood, and fomented by the zeal of the more ignorant and stupid sons of the church. It was not enough to reverence departed saints, and to confide in their intercession and succours; it was not enough to cloath them with an imaginary power of healing diseases, working miracles, and delivering from all sorts of calamities and dangers; their bones, their cloaths, the apparel, and furniture they had possessed during their lives, the very ground which they had touched, or in which their putrified carcases were laid, were treated with a stupid veneration, and supposed to retain the marvellous virtue of healing all disorders both of body and mind, and of defending such as possessed them against all the assaults and devices of Satan. The

C E N T.
IX.
PART II.
C

A passionate for d-
nals for
their renes
prevails.

[m] Of all the lives of the saints written in this century, none are more liable to suspicion than those drawn up by the Britons and Normans. See MABILLON *Præf. ad Sæc. 1. Benedicte. sub init.*

C E N T.
IX.
PART II.

consequence of this wretched notion was, that every one was eager to provide himself with these salutary remedies, for which purpose great numbers undertook fatiguing and perilous voyages, and subjected themselves to all sorts of hardships; while others made use of this delusion to accumulate their riches, and to impose upon the miserable multitude by the most impious and shocking inventions. As the demand for relics was prodigious and universal, the clergy employed all their dexterity to satisfy these demands, and were far from being nice in the methods they used for that end. The bodies of the saints were sought by fasting and prayer instituted by the priest in order to obtain a divine answer, and an infallible direction, and this pretended direction never failed to accomplish their desires; the holy carcass was always found, and that always in consequence, as they impiously gave out, of the suggestion and inspiration of God himself. Each discovery of this kind was attended with excessive demonstrations of joy, and animated the zeal of these devout seekers to enrich the church still more and more with this new kind of treasure. Many travelled with this view into the eastern provinces, and frequented the places which CHRIST and his disciples had honoured with their presence, that, with the bones and other secret remains of the first heralds of the gospel, they might comfort dejected minds, calm trembling consciences, save sinking states, and defend their inhabitants from all sorts of calamities. Nor did these pious travellers return home empty; the craft, dexterity, and knavery of the Greeks found a rich prey in the stupid credulity of the Latin relic-hunters, and made a profitable commerce of this new devotion. The latter paid considerable sums for legs and arms, skulls and jaw-bones (several of which were Pagan, and some not human), and other

other things that were supposed to have belonged to the primitive worthies of the Christian church; and thus the Latin churches came to the possession of those celebrated relics of St. MARK, St. JAMES, St. BARTHOLOMEW, CYPRIAN, PANTALEON, and others, which they shew at this day with so much ostentation. But there were many, who, unable to procure for themselves these spiritual treasures by voyages and prayers, had recourse to violence and theft; for all sorts of means, and all sorts of attempts in a cause of this nature were considered, when successful, as pious and acceptable to the Supreme Being [n].

VII. The study of the holy scriptures languished much among the Greeks in this century. PHOTIUS, who composed a book of *Questions* [o], relating to various passages of scripture, *An exposition of the Epistles of St. PAUL*, and other productions of the same nature [p], was one of the few that employed their talents in the illustration of the sacred writings. He was a man of great sagacity and genius, who preferred the dictates of reason to the decisions of authority; notwithstanding all which, he cannot be recommended as a model to

The exposition of the scriptures neglected among the Greeks.

[n] See MURATORI *Antiq. Ital. medi ævi*, tom. v. p. 6. who gives examples of the truth of this assertion.

[o] This work, which is entitled *Amphilochia*, from its having been addressed to AMPHILOCHIUS, bishop of *Cyzicum*, consists of 308 questions, and answers to them; a fifth part of which, at least, are to be found in the *Epistles of Photius*, published at London in 1651, by bishop MONTAGUE. The most of these questions relate to different texts of the *Old and New Testament*; but these are interspersed with others of a philological and literary kind. This work is still extant in MSS. in the Vatican, Barberinian, and Bavarian libraries.

[p] Such as a *catena*, a *chain*, of commentaries on the book of *Psalms*, compiled from the writings of ATHANASIUS, BASIL, CHRYSOSTOM, &c. and a commentary upon the *Prophets*, both of which are yet extant in MSS. the former in the *Bibliotheca Segueriana*, or *Cosliniana*, and the latter in the Vatican library.

CEN T. IX. other commentators. The other Greek writers, who attempted to explain the holy scriptures, did little more than compile and accumulate various passages from the commentators of the preceding ages; and this method was the origin of those *Catene*, or chains of commentaries, so much in vogue among the Greeks during this century, of which a considerable number have come down to our times, and which consisted entirely in a collection of the explications of scripture that were scattered up and down in the ancient writers. The greatest part of the theological writers, finding themselves incapable of more arduous undertakings, confined their labours to this compiling method, to the great detriment of sacred criticism.

Defects of
the Latin
commenta-
tors.

VIII. The Latin commentators were vastly superior in number to those among the Greeks, which was owing to the zeal and munificence of CHARLEMAGNE, who, both by his liberality and by his example, had excited and encouraged the doctors of the preceding age to the study of the scriptures. Of these expositors there are two, at least, who are worthy of esteem, CHRISTIAN DRUTHMAR, whose *Commentary on St. MATTHEW*, is come down to our times [q]; and the abbot BERTHARIUS, whose *Two Books concerning Fundamentals*, are also said to be yet extant. The rest seem unequal to the important office of sacred critics, and may be divided into two classes, which we have had already occasion to mention in the course of this history; the class of those, who merely collected and reduced into a mass the opinions and explications of the ancients, and that

[q] See R. SIMON, *Histoire critique des principaux commentateurs du Nouveau Testament*, chap. xlv. p. 348; as also his *Critique de la Bibliotheque Ecclesiastique de M. DU PIN*, tom. i. p. 293. who, in his xxvith and xxviii chapter, gives an account of most of the writers mentioned here.

of a fantastic set of expositors, who were always hunting after mysteries in the plainest expressions, and labouring to deduce a variety of abstruse and hidden significations from every passage of scripture, all which they did, for the most part, in a very clumsy and uncouth manner. At the head of the first class was RABANUS MAURUS, who acknowledges that he borrowed from the ancient doctors the materials he made use of in illustrating the Gospel of St. MATTHEW, and the Epistles of St. PAUL; WALAFRID STRABO, who borrowed his explications chiefly from RABANUS; CLAUDIUS of *Turin*, who trod in the footsteps of AUGUSTIN and ORIGEN; HINCMAR, whose *Exposition of the IV Books of Kings* compiled from the fathers, are yet extant; REMIGIUS of *Auxerre*, who derived from the same source his illustrations on the *Psalms*, and other books of sacred writ: SEDULIUS, who explained in the same manner the Epistles of St. PAUL; FLORUS, HAYMO bishop of *Halberstadt*, and others, whom, for the sake of brevity, we pass in silence.

C E N T.
IX.
PART II.

IX. RABANUS MAURUS, whom we introduced above at the head of the compilers of the fathers, deserves also an eminent place among the allegorical commentators, on account of his diffuse and tedious work, entitled *Scripture Allegories*. To this class also belong SMARAGDUS, HAYMO, SCOTUS, PASHASIUS RADBERT, and many others, whom it is not necessary to mention. The fundamental and general principle, in which all the writers of this class agree, is, that, besides the literal signification of each passage in scripture, there are hidden and deep senses which escape the vulgar eye; but they are not agreed about the number of these mysterious significations. Some attribute to every phrase three senses; others four; others again five; nay, their number is carried to seven by ANGELOME, a monk of *Lysieux*, an acute,

Allegorists.

CENT.
IX.
PART II.

The state
of didactic
theology.

though fantastic writer, and who is far from deserving the meanest rank among the expositors of this century [r].

X. The teachers of theology were still more contemptible than the commentators, and the Greeks, as well as the Latins, were extremely negligent both in unfolding the nature, and proving the truth of the doctrines of Christianity. Their method of inculcating divine truth was dry and unsatisfactory, and more adapted to fill the memory with sentences, than to enlighten the understanding, or to improve the judgment. The Greeks, for the most part, followed implicitly DAMASCENUS, while the Latins submitted their hoodwinked intellects to the authority of AUGUSTINE. Authority became the test of truth, and supplied in arrogance what it wanted in argument. That magisterial decisions were employed in the place of reason, appears manifestly from the *Colledaneum de tribus questionibus* of SERVATUS LUPUS; and also from a *Treatise* of REMIGIUS, concerning the necessity of holding fast the truths of the gospel, and of maintaining inviolable the sacred authority of the holy and orthodox fathers. If any deigned to appeal to the authority of the scriptures in defence of their systems, they either explained them in an allegorical manner, or understood them in the sense that had been given to them by the decrees of councils, or in the writings of the fathers; from which senses they thought it both unlawful and impious to depart. The Irish doctors alone, and particularly JOHANNES SCOTUS, had the courage to spurn the ignominy

[r] See the Preface to his *Commentary on the book of Kings*, in the *Bibliotheca Patrum Maxima*, tom. xv. p. 308. The commentary of ANGELOME upon the book of *Genesis* was published by BERNARD PEZIUS, in his *Thesaurus Anecdotorum*, tom. i. part I. but, indeed, the loss would not have been great had it never seen the light.

ous fetters of authority, and to explain the sublime doctrines of Christianity in a manner conformable to the dictates of reason, and the principles of true philosophy. But this noble attempt drew upon them the malignant fury of a superstitious age, and exposed them to the hatred of the Latin theologians, who would not permit either reason or philosophy to meddle themselves in religious matters [s].

XI. The important science of morals suffered, like all others, in the hands of ignorant and unskillful writers. The labours of some were wholly employed in collecting from the fathers an indigested heap of maxims and sentences concerning religious and moral duties; and such, among others, was the work of ALVARUS, intitled *Scintille Patrum*. Others wrote in a more systematic manner concerning virtue and vice, such as HALITGARIUS, RABANUS MAURUS, and JONAS, bishop of Orleans; but the representations they gave of the one and the other were very different from those which we find in the gospel of CHRIST. Others again fell into that most absurd and delusive method of instructing the ignorant in the will of God by a fantastic combination of figures and allegories; and several of the Greeks began to turn their studies towards the resolving *cases of conscience* [t], in order to remove the difficulties that arose in scrupulous and timorous minds. We pass in silence the writers of homilies and books of penance, of which there was a considerable number in this century.

Of Christian
morality.

[s] For an account of the persecution and hatred that JOHANNES SCOTUS suffered in the cause of reason and liberty, see DU BOULAY, *Hist. Academ. Paris.* tom. i. p. 182; as also MABILLON, *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened. Sæc. v.* 392.

[t] See NICEPHORI *Chartophylac. Epistolæ Duæ*, in the *Bibliotheca Magna Patrum*, tom. iii. p. 413.

GEN T.
IX.
PART II.

The pro-
gress of
mysticism.

XII. The doctrine of the mystics, whose origin is falsely attributed to DIONYSIUS the *Arcopagite*, and whose precepts were designed to elevate the soul above all sensible and terrestrial objects, and to unite it to the Deity in an ineffable manner, had been now for a long time in vogue among the Greeks, and more especially among the monastic orders. And to augment the credit of this fanatical sect, and multiply its followers, MICHAEL SYNCLELLUS and METHODIUS composed the most pompous and eloquent panegyrics upon the memory of DIONYSIUS, in which his virtues were celebrated with the utmost exaggeration. The Latins were not as yet bewitched with the specious appearance, and the illusory charms of the mystic devotion, which was equally adapted to affect persons of a lively fancy and those of a more gloomy turn of mind. They lived in a happy ignorance of this contagious doctrine, when the Grecian emperor MICHAEL BALBUS sent to LEWIS the MEEK, in the year 824, a copy of the pretended works [u] of DIONYSIUS the *Arcopagite*, which fatal present kindled immediately the holy flame of mysticism in the western provinces, and filled the Latins with the most enthusiastic admiration of this new religion. The translation of these spurious works into Latin by the express order of the emperor [w], who could not be easy while

[u] USSERI *Sylloge Epp. Hibernicar.* p. 54, 55. The spuriousness of these works is now universally granted by the most learned and impartial of the Roman catholic writers, as they contain accounts of many events that happened several ages after the time of DIONYSIUS, and were not at all mentioned until after the fifth century. See FLEURY, *Hist. Eccles.* livr. liv. tom. xi. p. 520. edit. *Bruxelles*.

[w] That these books were translated by the order of LEWIS, appears manifestly from the *Epistle* to that emperor, which HILDUIN prefixed to his *Arcopagetica*, and in which (p. 66, edit. *Colon.* 1563.) we find the following passage: *De notitia librorum, quos (Dionysius) patris sermone conscripsit, et quibus peten-*

while his subjects were deprived of such inestimable treasure, contributed much to the progress of mysticism. By the order of the same emperor, HILDUIN, abbot of St. *Denys*, composed an account of the life, actions, and writings of DIONYSIUS, under the title of *Areopagitica*, in which work, among other impudent fictions, usual in those times of superstition and imposture, he maintained, in order to exalt the honour of his nation, that DIONYSIUS the *Arcopagite*, and DIONYSIUS the bishop of *Paris*, were one and the same person [x]. This fable, which was invented with unparalleled assurance, was received with the most perfect and unthinking credulity, and made such a deep and permanent impression upon the minds of the French, that the repeated demonstrations of its falsehood have not as yet been sufficient to ruin its credit entirely. As the first translation of the works of DIONYSIUS, that had been done by the order of LEWIS the MEEK, was probably in a barbarous and obscure style, a new and more elegant one was given by the famous JOHANNES SCOTUS ERIGENA, at the request of CHARLES the

petentibus illos composuit, lectio nobis per Dei gratiam et vestram ordinationem, CUJUS DISPENSATIONE INTERPRETATOS, sermō nostra eos petentibus reserant, satisfuit. From this passage it is evident that they are mistaken, who affirm that the Latin translation of the works of DIONYSIUS was not made before the time of CHARLES the BALD. And they err also, who, with MABILLON, *Annal. Benedicte*. tom. ii. lib. xvix. § 59. p. 488. and the authors of the *Hist. Litt. de la France*, tom. v. p. 421. inform us, that MICHAEL BALBUS sent these works already translated into Latin to the emperor LEWIS. It is amazing how men of learning could fall into this latter error, after reading the following passage in the *Epistle* above quoted: *Authenticos namque eosdem (Dionysii) libros Græca lingua conscriptos, cum economus ecclesiæ Constantinopolitanæ et ceteri missi Michaelis legatione—juncti sunt—pro munere magna suscepimus.*

[x] LAUNCEY, *Diff. de Discrimine Dionysii Areopag. et Parisiensis*, cap. iv. p. 33. tom. i. p. I. opp. as also the writings of this great man concerning the *Two Dionysii*.

BALD,

C E N T. IX. **P A R T II.** **BALD**, the publication of which increased considerably the partisans of the mystic theology among the French, Italians, and Germans. **SCOTUS** himself was so enchanted with this new doctrine, that he incorporated it into his philosophical system; and upon all occasions either accommodated his philosophy to it, or explained it according to the principles of his philosophy.

The state of
polemic, or
controversial
theology.

XIII. The defence of Christianity against the Jews and Pagans was greatly neglected in this century, in which the intestine disputes and dissensions that divided the church, gave sufficient employment to such as had an inclination to controversy, or a talent of managing it with dexterity and knowledge. **AGOBARD**, however, as also **AMULO** and **RABANUS MAURUS**, chastised the insolence and malignity of the Jews, and exposed their various absurdities and errors, while the emperor **LEO**, **THEODORUS ABUCARA**, and other writers, whose performances are lost, employed their polemic labours against the progress of the Saracens, and refuted their impious and extravagant system. But it may be observed in general of those who wrote against the Saracens, that they reported many things, both concerning **MAHOMET** and his religion, which were far from being true; and if, as there is too much reason to imagine, they did this designedly and knowing the falsehood, or at least the uncertainty of what they alleged against these infidels, we must look upon their writings rather as intended to deter the Christians from apostasy, than to give a rational refutation of the Saracen doctrine.

The controversy
concerning
images
among the
Greeks.

XIV. The contests of the Christians among themselves were carried on with greater eagerness and animosity than the disputes in which they were engaged with the common enemies of their faith; and these contests were daily productive of new calamities and disorders which dishonoured their

their profession, and cast a heavy, though undeserved reproach upon the cause of true religion. After the banishment of IRENE, the controversy concerning images broke out anew among the Greeks, and was carried on by the contending parties, during the half of this century, with various and uncertain success. The emperor NICEPHORUS, though he did not abrogate the decrees of the council of *Nice*, nor order the images to be taken out of the churches, yet deprived the patrons of image-worship of all power to molest or injure their adversaries, and seems upon the whole to have been an enemy to that idolatrous service. But his successor MICHAEL CUROPALATES, surnamed RHANGEBE, acted in a very different manner. Feeble and timorous, and dreading the rage of the priests and monks that maintained the cause of images, he favoured that cause during his short reign, and persecuted its adversaries with the greatest bitterness and cruelty. The scene changed again, upon the accession of LEO the Armenian to the empire, who abolished the decrees of the Nicene council relating to the use and worship of images, in a council assembled at *Constantinople*, A. D. 814 [y]; without however enacting any penal laws against their idolatrous worshippers. This moderation, far from satisfying the patriarch NICEPHORUS, and the other partisans of image-worship, only served to encourage their obstinacy, and to increase their insolence; upon which the emperor removed the haughty prelate from his office, and chastised the fury of several of his adherents with a deserved punishment. His successor MICHAEL, surnamed BALBUS, or the *Stammerer*, was obliged to observe the same conduct, and to depart from the clemency and indulgence, which, in the beginning

[y] FLEURY and some other writers place the meeting of this council in the year 815.

CENT. of his reign, he had discovered towards the wor-
 XI. shippers of images, whose idolatry, however, he
 PART II. was far from approving; the monks more espe-
 cially provoked his indignation by their fanatical
 rage, and forced him to treat them with particu-
 lar severity. But the zeal of his son and successor
 THEOPHILUS, in discouraging this new idolatry,
 was still more vehement; for he opposed the wor-
 shippers of images with great violence, and went
 so far as to put to death some of the more obsti-
 nate ringleaders of that impetuous faction.

XV. Upon the death of THEOPHILUS, which
 happened in the year 842, the regency was en-
 trusted with the empress THEODORA during her
 son's minority. This superstitious prince, fati-
 gued with the importunate solicitations of the
 monks, deluded by their forged miracles, and
 not a little influenced also by their insolent threats,
 assembled, in the year above mentioned, a coun-
 cil at *Constantinople*, in which the decrees of the
 second Nicene council were reinstated in their lost
 authority, and the Greeks were indulged in their
 corrupt propensity to image-worship by a law
 which encouraged that wretched idolatry [x]. So
 that after a controversy, which had been carried
 on during the space of an hundred and ten years,
 the cause of idolatry triumphed over the dictates
 of reason and Christianity; the whole east, the
 Armenians excepted, bowed down before the vic-
 torious images; nor did any of the succeeding
 emperors attempt to cure the Greeks of this su-
 perstitious phrenzy, or restrain them in the per-
 formance of this childish worship. The council
 that was held at *Constantinople* under PHOTIUS, in
 the year 879, and which is reckoned by the Greeks

[x] See FRED. SPANHEIM, *Historia Imaginum*, sect. viii.
 p. 845. tom. ii. opp.—LENFANT, *Préservatif contre la Ré-
 union avec le Siège de Rome*, tom. iii. lett. xiv. p. 147. lett. xviii,
 xix. p. 509.

the *Eighth general council*, gave a farther degree of force and vigour to idolatry, by maintaining the sanctity of images, and approving, confirming, and renewing the Nicene decrees. The superstitious Greeks, who were blind-led by the monks in the most ignominious manner, esteemed this council as a most signal blessing derived to them from the immediate interposition of heaven, and accordingly instituted in commemoration thereof an anniversary festival, which was called the *Feast of Orthodoxy* [a].

XVI. The triumph of images, notwithstanding the zealous efforts of the Roman pontiffs in their favour, was obtained with much more difficulty among the Latins, than it had been among the Greeks; for the former maintained as yet that invaluable, and indeed unalienable, privilege of judging for themselves in religious matters, and were far from being disposed to submit their reason implicitly to the decisions of the pontiff, or to look upon any thing as infallible and true, which had authority for its only foundation. The most of the European Christians, as we have seen already, steered a middle course between the idolaters and the Iconoclasts, between those who were zealous for the worship of images on the one hand, and those who were averse to all use of them on the other. They were of opinion, that images might be suffered as the means of aiding the memory of the faithful, and of calling to their remembrance the pious exploits and the virtuous actions of the persons they represented; but they detested all thoughts of paying them the least marks of religious homage or adoration. Mir-

Among the
Latins.

[a] See GRETSEK *Observat. in Codicum de officiis Aulae et Eccles. Constantinopolitanae*, lib. iii. cap. viii. as also the *Ceremoniale Byzantinum*, lately published by REISK, lib. i. c. xxviii. p. 92.

CENT.
IX.
PART II.

CHAELE BALBUS, when he sent, in the year 824, a solemn embassy to LEWIS the MEEK, to renew and confirm the treaties of friendship and peace that had been concluded between his predecessors in the empire and CHARLEMAGNE, charged his ministers, in a particular manner, to bring over the king of the Franks [b] to the party of the Iconoclasts, that they might gradually suppress, by their united influence, the worship of images, and thus restore concord and tranquillity to the church. LEWIS, upon this occasion, assembled a council at *Paris*, A. D. 824 [c], in order to examine the proposal of the Grecian emperor, in which it was resolved to adhere to the decrees of the council of *Frankfort*, which allowed the use of images in the churches, but severely prohibited the treating them with the smallest marks of religious worship. But in process of time the European Christians departed gradually from the observance of this injunction, and fell imperceptibly into a blind submission to the decisions of

☞ [b] So MICHAEL and his son THEOPHILUS style LEWIS in their letter to him, refusing him the title of emperor, to which, however, he had an undoubted right in consequence of the treaties which they now desired to renew.

☞ [c] FLEURY, LE SUEUR, and other historians, place unanimously this council in the year 825. It may be proper to observe here, that the proceedings of this council evidently shew, that the decisions of the Roman pontif were by no means looked upon at this time either as obligatory or infallible. For when the letter of Pope ADRIAN, in favour of images, was read in the council, it was almost unanimously rejected, as containing absurd and erroneous opinions. The decrees of the second council of *Nice*, relating to image-worship, were also censured by the Gallican bishops: and the authority of that council, though received by several popes as an œcumenical one, absolutely rejected. And what is remarkable is, that the pope did not, on this account, declare the Gallican bishops heretics, nor exclude them from the communion of the apostolic see. See FLEURY, liv. xlvii.

the Roman pontif, whose influence and authority grew more formidable from day to day : so that towards the conclusion of this century, the Gallican clergy began to pay a certain kind of religious homage to the saintly images, in which their example was followed by the Germans and other nations [d].

XVII. Notwithstanding this apostasy, the Iconoclasts were not destitute of adherents among the Latins. The most eminent of these was CLAUDIUS, bishop of *Turin*, by birth a Spaniard, and also a disciple of FELIX, bishop of *Urgel*. This zealous prelate, as soon as he had obtained the episcopal dignity through the favour of LEWIS the MEEK, began to exercise the duties of his function in the year 823, by ordering all images, and even the cross, to be cast out of the churches, and committed to the flames. The year following he composed a treatise, in which he not only defended these vehement proceedings, and declared against the *use*, as well as the *worship*, of images, but also broached several other opinions, that were quite contrary to the notions of the multitude, and to the prejudices of the times. He denied, among other things, in opposition to the Greeks, that the cross was to be honoured with any kind of worship; he treated relics with the utmost contempt, as absolutely destitute of the virtues that were attributed to them, and censured with much freedom and severity those pilgrimages to the holy land, and those voyages to the tombs of the saints, which, in this century, were looked upon as extremely salutary, and particularly meritorious. This noble stand, in the defence of true religion, drew upon CLAUDIUS a

Several Iconoclasts among the Latins.

[d] MABILLON, *Annal. Benedic.* tom. ii. p. 488.—Id. *Præf. ad Sæc. iv. Act. SS. Ord. Benedic.* Sæc. iv. part I. p. 7, 8.—LE COINTE, *Annal. Eccles. Francor.* tom. iv. ad a. 824.

C E N T. multitude of adversaries; the sons of superstition
 IX. rushed upon him from all quarters; THEODEMIR
 PART II. DUNGALLUS, JONAS of Orleans, and WALAFRI-
 DUS STRABO [e] united to overwhelm him with
 their voluminous answers. But the learned and
 venerable prelate maintained his ground [f], and
 supported his cause with such dexterity and force
 that it remained triumphant, and gained new
 credit. And hence it happened, that the city of
 Turin and the adjacent country were, for a long
 time after the death of CLAUDIUS, much less in-
 fected with superstition than the other parts of
 Europe.

Continua-
 tion of the
 controversy
 concerning
 the deriva-
 tion or pro-
 ception of
 the Holy
 Ghost.

XVIII. The controversy that had been carried
 on in the preceding century concerning the *pro-
 ception* (if we may be allowed that term) of the
 Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son, and
 also concerning the word *filioque*, foisted by the
 Latins into the Creed of Constantinople, broke out
 now with redoubled vehemence, and from a pri-
 vate dispute became a flaming contest between the
 Greek and Latin churches. The monks of Je-
 rusalem distinguished themselves in this contro-
 versy, and complained particularly of the inter-
 polation of the words *filioque*, i. e. *and from the
 son*, in the above-mentioned symbol; nor did they
 stop here, but dispatched to CHARLEMAGNE, in
 the year 809, a certain ecclesiastic of their order,
 whose name was JOHN, to obtain satisfaction in
 this matter [g]. The affair was debated in due

[e] In order to do justice to the adversaries of CLAUDIUS
 here mentioned, it is necessary to observe, that they only
 maintained the innocence and usefulness of images, without
 pretending to represent them as objects of religious worship.

[f] MABILLON, *Annal. Benedicte*. tom. ii. p. 438.—
Préf. ad Sæc. iv. Act. SS. Ord. Benedicte. p. 8.—*Histoire
 Litter de la France*, tom. iv. p. 491. & tom. v. p. 27. 64.—
 JAQ. BASNAGE, *Histoire des Eglises Reformées*, tom. 1. period
 iv. p. 38. ed. in 4to.

[g] See STEPH. BALUZII *Miscellanea*, tom. vii. p. 14.

form, both in a council assembled this same year at *Aix-la-Chapelle* and at *Rome*, in presence of the sovereign pontif *LEO III.*, to whom the emperor had sent ambassadors for that purpose. *LEO* adopted the doctrine which represented the Holy Ghost as proceeding from the Father and the Son, but he condemned the addition that had been made to the symbol [*b*], and declared it as his opinion, that the word *filioque*, or *from the son*, as it was a glaring interpolation, ought to be omitted in reading the symbol, and at length struck out of it entirely, not every where at once, but in such a prudent manner as to prevent disturbance. His successors were of the same opinion: the word, however, being once admitted, not only kept its place in opposition to the Roman pontifs, but was by degrees added to the symbol in all the Latin churches [*z*].

XIX. To these disputes of ancient origin were added controversies entirely new, and particularly that famous one *Concerning the manner in which the body and blood of Christ were present in the eucharist*. It had been hitherto the unanimous opinion of the church, that the body and blood of *CHRIST* were administered to those who received the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and that they were consequently *present* at that holy institution; but the sentiments of Christians concerning the *nature* and *manner* of this *presence* were various and contradictory, nor had any council determined with precision that important point, or prescribed the manner in which this pretended presence was to be

The controversy concerning the eucharist set on foot by Pascaſius Radbert.

[*b*] This addition of the word *filioque* to the symbol of *Nice* and *Constantinople* was made in the vith and viith centuries by the churches of *Spain*, and their example was followed by most of the Gallian churches, where the symbol was read and sung with this addition.

[*z*] See *LE COINTE, Annal. Eccles. Francor.* tom. iv. ad A. 809.—*LONGUEVAL, Histoire de l'Eglise Gallicane*, tom. v. p. 151.

understood. Both reason and folly were hitherto left free in this matter, nor had any imperious mode of faith suspended the exercise of the one, or restrained the extravagance of the other. But in this century PASCASIUS RADBERT, a monk, and afterwards abbot of *Corbey*, pretended to explain with precision, and to determine with certainty, the doctrine of the church on this head, for which purpose he composed, in the year 831, a treatise *Concerning the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ* [k]. A second edition of this treatise, revised with care and considerably augmented, was presented in the year 845 to CHARLES the BALD, and gave principally occasion to the warm and important controversy that ensued. The doctrine of PASCASIUS amounted in general to the two following propositions: *First*, that, after the consecration of the bread and wine in the Lord's supper, nothing remained of these symbols but the *outward figure*, under which the body and blood of CHRIST were really and locally present; and *secondly*, that the body of CHRIST thus present in the eucharist was the *same body that was born of the Virgin, that suffered upon the Cross, and was raised from the dead*. This new doctrine, and more especially the second proposition now mentioned, excited, as might well be expected, the astonishment of many. Accordingly it was opposed by RABANUS MAURUS, HERIBALD, and others, though they did not all refute it in the same method, nor upon the same principles. CHARLES the BALD, upon this occasion, ordered

[k] See MABILLON, *Annales Benedi.* ii. p. 539. An accurate edition of RADBERT's book is published by MARTENE, in the ix. tome of his *Ampliss. Collect. veter. scriptor.* p. 378. The life and actions of this wrong-headed divine are treated of at large by MABILLON, in his *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Benedi.* Sac. iv. part II. 126, and, by the Jesuits, in the *Acta SS. Antwerp. ad d. xxvi. Aprilis.*

the famous RATRAMN and JOHANNES SCOTUS to draw up a clear and rational explication of that important doctrine which RADBERT seemed to have so egregiously corrupted [l]. These learned divines executed with zeal and diligence the order of the emperor. The treatise of SCOTUS perished in the ruins of time, but that of RATRAMN is still extant [m], and furnished ample matter of dispute both in the last and present century [n].

CENT.
IX.
PART II.

XX. It is remarkable that in this controversy each of the contending parties were almost as much divided among themselves as they were at variance with their adversaries. RADBERT, who began the dispute, contradicts himself in many places, departs from his own principles, and maintains in one part of his book conclusions that he had disavowed in another. His principal adversary BERTRAMN, or RATRAMN, seems in some respects liable to the same charge; he appears to follow in general the doctrine of those, who deny that the body and blood of CHRIST are *really* present in the holy sacrament, and to affirm on the contrary that they are only represented by the bread and wine as their signs or symbols. There are, however, several passages in his book which seem inconsistent with this just and rational notion of the eucharist, or at least as susceptible of dif-

And carried
on by his
adversary
Bertramn.

[l] For an account of RATRAMN, or BERTRAMN, and his famous book which has made so much noise in the world, see FABRICIUS *Biblioth. Lat. medii ævi*, tom. i. p. 1661.

[m] A new English translation of the book of BERTRAMN, priest and monk of Corbey, *Concerning the Body and Blood of JESUS CHRIST in the sacrament*, was published in Dublin in the year 1753; to which is prefixed a very learned and judicious Historical Dissertation concerning this famous author and his works, in which both are ably defended against the calumnies and fictions of the Roman catholic writers.

[n] There is an account, but a partial one, of this controversy in MABILLON's *Bref. ad Sæc.* iv. part II. *Benedict.* p. viii. which the curious reader will therefore do well to compare with BASNAGE's *Histoire de l'Eglise*, tom. i. 909.

C E N T.
IX.
PART II.

ferent interpretations, and have therefore given rise to various disputes. JOHANNES SCOTUS, whose philosophical genius rendered him more accurate, and shed through his writings that logical precision so much wanted, and so highly desirable in polemical productions, was the only disputant in this contest who expressed his sentiments with perspicuity, method, and consistency, and declared plainly that the bread and wine were the *signs* and *symbols* of the *absent* body and blood of CHRIST. All the other theologists of his time fluctuate and waver in their opinions, express themselves with ambiguity, and embrace and reject the same tenets at different times, as if they had no fixed or permanent principles concerning the matter in question. From all this, however, it evidently appears, that there was not as yet in the Latin church any fixed or universally received opinion concerning the manner in which the body and blood of *Christ* are present in the eucharist.

XXI. The disputants in this controversy charged each other reciprocally with the most odious doctrines, which each party drew by way of consequences from the tenets they opposed, a method of proceeding as unjust, as it is common in all kinds of debate. Hence arose that imaginary heresy, that upon the triumphant progress of the doctrine of transubstantiation in the eleventh century, was branded with the title of *Stercoranism*, and of which the true origin was as follows: They who, embracing the opinion of PASCASIUS RADBERT, believed that the bread and wine in the sacrament were substantially changed after the consecration, and preserved only their external figure, drew a most unjust conclusion from the opinion of their adversaries, who maintained on the contrary that the bread and wine preserved their substance, and that CHRIST's body and blood were only figuratively, and not really present in
the

the eucharist. They alleged that the doctrine of the latter implied, that the body of Christ was digested in the stomach, and was thrown out with the other excrements. But this consequence was quickly retorted upon those that imagined it; for they who denied the metamorphosis of the bread and wine into the real body and blood of CHRIST, charged the same enormous consequence upon their antagonists who believed this transmutation; and the charge was much more applicable certainly to the latter than to the former. The truth of the matter is, that it was neither truly applicable to the one nor to the other, and their mutual reproaches, most wretchedly founded, shew rather a spirit of invective, than a zeal for the truth. The charge of *Stercoranism* is but a malignant invention; it can never, without the most absurd impudence, be brought against those who deny the transmutation of the bread into the body of CHRIST; it may indeed be charged upon such as allow of this transmutation, though it be a consequence that none of them, who were not frenetic, did perhaps ever avow [o].

XXII. While this controversy was at its greatest height, another, of a quite different kind, and of much more importance, arose, whose unhappy consequences are yet felt in the reformed churches. The subject of this new contest was the doctrine of *predestination* and *divine grace*, and its rise is universally attributed to GODLSCHALCUS, an illustrious Saxon, who had entered involuntarily into the monastic order in the convent of *Fulda*, from whence he removed to the monastery of *Orbais*, in the diocese of *Soissons*, where he prosecuted his theological studies with great assiduity,

The controversy concerning predestination and grace, set on foot by Godlscalcus.

[o] For an account of the *Stercoranists*, see MABILLON, *Præf. ad Sac. iv. Benedict.* part II. p. 21.—J. BASNAGE, *Histoire de l'Eglise*, tom. i. p. 926. and a Treatise of the learned Dr. PFAFF, published at *Tubingue* in 1750.

CENT.
IX.
PART II.

but also with an insatiable desire of founding the deepest mysteries, and of being *wise above what is written*. This eminent ecclesiastic, upon his return from *Rome* in the year 847, took up his lodging for some time with count EBERALD, one of the first noblemen at the court of the emperor LOTHAIRE, where he discoursed largely concerning the intricate doctrine of *predestination* in presence of NOTHINGUS, bishop of *Verona*, and maintained that God, from all eternity, had pre-ordained some to everlasting life, and others to everlasting punishment and misery. RABANUS MAURUS, who was by no means his friend, being informed of his propagating this doctrine, opposed him with all his might. To render his opposition more successful, he began by representing GODSCHALCUS as a corrupter of the true religion, and a forger of monstrous heresies, in some letters addressed to count EBERALD, and to the bishop of *Verona*. And when the accused monk came from *Italy* into *Germany* to justify himself against these clamours, and for that purpose appeared at *Mentz*, of which RABANUS his accuser was archbishop, he was condemned in a council assembled by the latter in that city A. D. 848, and sent from thence to HINCMAR, archbishop of *Rheims*, in which diocese he had received the order of priesthood. HINCMAR, who was devoted to the interests of RABANUS, assembled a council at *Quiercy* A. D. 849, in which GODSCHALCUS was condemned a second time, and was also treated in a manner equally repugnant to the principles of religion and the dictates of humanity. Because he was firm in maintaining his doctrine, which he affirmed, and indeed with truth, to be the doctrine of St. AUGUSTINE, the imperious HINCMAR degraded him from the priesthood, and was so barbarous as to order him to be whipped with the utmost severity, until the force of his pain over-
powering

powering his constancy obliged him, according to the commands of his reverend executioners, to burn with his own hands the justification of his opinions which he had presented to the council of *Mentz*. After these barbarous proceedings, the unfortunate monk was cast into prison in the monastery of *Hautvilliers*, where he ended his misery and his days in the year 868, or the year following, maintaining with his last breath the doctrine for which he had suffered.

C E N T.
IX.
P A R T II.

XXIII. While *GODESCHALCUS* lay in prison, his doctrine gained him followers, his sufferings excited compassion, and both together produced a considerable schism in the Latin church. *RATRAMN*, monk of *Corbey*, *PRUDENTIUS*, bishop of *Troyes*, *LOUP*, or *LUPUS*, abbot of *Ferrieres*, *FLO- RUS*, deacon of *Lyons*, *REMI*, archbishop of the same city, with his whole church, all these eminent and illustrious ecclesiastics, with many others whom it would be tedious to mention, pleaded with the utmost zeal and vehemence, both in their writings and in their discourse, the cause of this unhappy monk, and of his condemned opinions. Some indeed confined themselves principally to the defence of his person and conduct; while others went farther, and employed all their zeal, and all their labour, in the vindication of his doctrine. On the opposite side of the question were *HINCMAR*, his unrighteous judge, *AMALARIUS*, the celebrated *JOHANNES SCOTUS*, and others, who all maintained that *GODESCHALCUS* and his opinions had received the treatment they deserved. As the spirit of controversy ran high between these contending parties, and grew more vehement from day to day, *CHARLES* the *BALD* summoned a new council, or synod, which met at *Quiercy* A. D. 853, in which, by the credit and influence of *HINCMAR*, the decrees of the former council were confirmed, and

The history
of this con-
test.

of

C E N T.
IX.
P A R T II.

of consequence GODESCHALCUS again condemned. But the decrees of this council were declared null, and decisions of a different kind, by which GODESCHALCUS and his doctrine were vindicated and defended, were substituted in their place in a council assembled at *Valence* in *Dauphiney*, A. D. 855. This council was composed of the clergy of three provinces, *Lyons*, *Vienne*, and *Arles*, with *REMI*, archbishop of *Lyons*, at their head, and its decrees were confirmed, in the year 859, by the council of *Langres*, in which the same clergy were assembled, and in 860, by the council of *Touss*, in which the bishops of fourteen provinces supported the cause of the persecuted monk, whose death diminished considerably the heat of this intricate controversy [p].

What judgment we are to form of this controversy.

XXIV. If we attend to the merits of this cause, we shall find that the debate subsists still in all its force, and that the doctrine of GODESCHALCUS has in our days both able defenders and powerful adversaries. He undoubtedly maintained a twofold predestination, one to everlasting life, and the other to eternal death. He held also, "that God did not desire or will the salvation of all mankind, but that of the elect only; and that CHRIST did not suffer death for the whole human race, but for that part of it only whom God has predestinated to eternal salvation." These decisions, which carry a severe and rigorous aspect, are softly and favourably interpreted

[p] Besides the common writers, who speak of this controversy, the curious reader will do well to consult the more learned and impartial accounts he will find of it in CÆSAR EGASSE DE BOUILLAY's *Hist. Acad. Paris.* tom. i. p. 178.—MABILLON, *Præf. ad Sæc. iv. Benedict.* part II. p. xlvii.—*Hist. Litteraire de la France*, tom. v. p. 352.—USSERI *Historia Godeschalchi*, *Hanovæ* 1662, in 8vo, et *Dublini* 1661, in 4to.—GERHARD. JOH. VOSSII *Historia Pelagiana*, lib. vii. cap. iv.—Add Jo. ALB. FABRICII *Biblioth. Latinæ medii ævi*, tom. iii. 210.

by

by the followers of GODESCHALCUS. They deny, for example, that their leader represents God as *predestinating* to a necessary course of iniquity, those whom he has previously *predestinated* to eternal misery, and, according to them, the doctrine of GODESCHALCUS amounts to no more than this: "That God has from all eternity doomed to everlasting misery such as he *foreſaw* would go on impenitent in a sinful course, and has decreed their ruin in consequence of their sins freely committed and eternally foreseen: that the salutary effects of the mercy of God, and the sufferings of Christ, extend indeed only to the elect, and are made good to them alone; though this mercy and these sufferings, considered in themselves, belong equally to all mankind." But this contradictory jargon did not satisfy the adversaries of the Predestinarian monk: they maintained, on the contrary, that under ambiguous terms and perplexed sentences GODESCHALCUS had concealed the most enormous errors, propagating it assiduously as an article of faith, "That God had not only by an original decree predestinated one part of mankind to eternal damnation, but had also pushed them on by an irresistible necessity, by a prepollent force, to those crimes and transgressions which were proper to render that damnation just [q]."

Without

[q] The cause of GODESCHALCUS has been very learnedly defended by the celebrated MAGUIN, who published also a valuable edition, which is yet extant, of all the treatises that were composed on both sides of this intricate controversy. This interesting collection, which was printed at Paris in the year 1650, in two volumes 4^{to}, bears the following title: *Veterum auctorum qui Nono Sæculo de Predestinatione et Gratia scripserunt, Opera et Fragmenta, cum Historia gemina Prefatione*. Cardinal NORIS maintained also the cause of the Predestinarian monk with more brevity, but less moderation than MAGUIN. This brief vindication may be seen in the *Synopsis Historiæ Godeschalchanæ*, which is inserted

CENT.
IX.
PART II.

Without determining any thing upon such an intricate and incomprehensible subject, with respect to which silence is the truest wisdom, we shall only observe, that the private quarrels, and mutual hatred, that prevailed between RABANUS MAURUS and GODESCHALCUS, were the real source of the Predestinarian controversy, and of all the calamities in which it involved that unfortunate monk [r].

Hincmar
and Godes-
chalculus dis-
pute con-
cerning the
words *Trinus
Deus*.

XXV. Another, though less important controversy arose about this time, concerning the concluding words of a very ancient hymn, which runs thus; *te, trina Deitas unaque, poscimus*, which may be thus translated, O God, who art three, and at the same time but one, we beseech thee, &c. HINCMAR wisely prohibited the singing these words in the churches that were under his jurisdiction, from a persuasion that they tended to introduce into the minds of the multitude notions inconsistent with the unity and sim-

serted in the 4th volume of the works of that cardinal, p. 677. All the Benedictines, Jansenists, and Augustin monks maintain, almost without exception, that GODESCHALCUS was most unjustly persecuted and oppressed by RABANUS MAURUS. The jesuits are of a different opinion; they assert in general, and LOUIS CELIOT, one of their order, has in a more particular manner laboured to demonstrate in his *Historia Godeschalci Predestinationis*, published at Paris in 1655, that the monk in question was justly condemned and deservedly punished.

[r] The parents of GODESCHALCUS consecrated him to God, by devoting him from his infancy, as was the custom of the times, to the monastic life in the monastery of *Fulda*. The young monk, however, being arrived at a certain age, seemed much disposed to abandon his retreat, to shake off his religious fetters, and return again into society; but he was prevented from the execution of this purpose by RABANUS MAURUS, who kept him, against his will, in his monastic bonds. Hence a violent contest arose between these two ecclesiastics, in which LEWIS the MEER was obliged to interpose, and hence the furious disputes concerning predestination and grace. See *Centuriæ Magdeb. Cent. ix. c. 10.*—MABILLON, *Annal. Bened. tom. ii. ad A. 829.* p. 523.

plicity of the Supreme Being, and might lead them to imagine that there were three Gods. But the Benedictine monks refused to obey this mandate, and BERTRAM, who was one of the most eminent of that order, wrote a large book to prove the expression *trina Deitas*, or *threefold Deity*, orthodox, from the authority of fathers, which was esteemed the only criterion of truth in these miserable times. GODESCHALCUS, who now lay in prison, heard of this dispute, entered warmly into it, and in a laboured dissertation supported the cause of his Benedictine brethren, on which account HINCMAR accused him of *tritbeism*, and drew up a treatise to prove the charge, and to refute that impious and enormous heresy. This controversy, however, was but of a short duration, and the exceptionable passage of the hymn in question maintained its credit, notwithstanding all the efforts of HINCMAR, and continued, as before, to be sung in the churches [s].

XXVI. A vain curiosity, and not any design of promoting useful knowledge and true piety, was the main source of the greatest part of the controversies that were carried on in this century. And it was more especially this idle curiosity, carried to an indecent and most extravagant length, that gave rise to the controversy *Concerning the manner in which Christ was born of the Virgin*, which began in *Germany*, and made its way from thence into *France*. Certain Germans maintained, that JESUS proceeded from his mother's womb in a manner quite different from those general and uniform laws of nature that regulate the birth of the human species; which opinion was no sooner known in *France* than it was warmly opposed by the famous RATRAMN, who wrote a book ex-

C E N T.
IX.
P A R T II.

The manner of
Christ's
birth be-
comes a
subj^t of
debate.

[s] There is an account of this controversy given by the writers of the life, actions, and doctrines of GODESCHALCUS.

prelsly

C E N T.
IX.
P A R T II.

prefly to prove that CHRIST entered into the world in the very same way with other mortals, and that his Virgin-mother bare him, as other women bring forth their offspring. PASCASIUS RADBERT, who was constantly employed either in inventing or patronizing the most extravagant fancies, adopted the opinion of the German doctors, and composed an elaborate treatise to prove that CHRIST was born, without his mother's womb being opened, in the same manner as he came into the chamber where his disciples were assembled after his resurrection, though the door was shut. He also charged those who held the opinion of RATRAMN with denying the virginity of MARY. This fruitless dispute was soon hushed, and gave place to controversies of superior moment [1].

The first
controversy
between
the Greeks
and Latins
on the
account of
Phoebus.

XXVII. Of all the controversies that divided Christians in this century, the most interesting, though at the same time the most lamentable, was that which occasioned the fatal schism between the Greek and Latin churches. A vindictive and jealous spirit of animosity and contention had, for a long time, prevailed between the bishops of *Rome* and *Constantinople*, and had sometimes broke out into acts of violence and rage. The ambition and fury of these contending prelates grew still more keen and vehement about the time of LEO the Isaurian, when the bishops of *Constantinople*, seconded by the power and authority of the emperors, withdrew from the jurisdiction of the Roman pontiffs many provinces, over which they had hitherto exercised a spiritual dominion [u]. But in this century they arose to an

[1] See LUCAS DACHERIUS, his *Spicilegium veterum Scriptorum*, tom. i. p. 396.—MABILLON, *Præf. ad Sac. IV. Benedict.* part II. p. 51.

[u] See GIANNONE, *Histoire de Naples*, tom. i. p. 535. 646.—PEIR. DE MARCA, *De concordia sacerdotii et imperii*, lib. i. cap. i. p. 6.—LEQUIEN, *Oriens Christianus*, tom. i. p. 96.

enormous

enormous height, and broke forth into a most dreadful flame, in the year 858 [*w*], when the learned PHOTIUS was chosen patriarch of *Constantinople*, by the emperor MICHAEL, in the place of IGNATIUS, whom that prince drove from his see and sent into exile. For this violent proceeding, though it was justified and applauded by a council assembled at *Constantinople* in the year 861, was far from being attended with a general approbation. IGNATIUS appealed from this council to the Roman pontif NICOLAS I., who espoused his interests, and, in a council assembled at *Rome* A. D. 862, excommunicated PHOTIUS as unlawfully elected; and his abettors for having been concerned in such an unrighteous cause. The new patriarch, however, was so far from being terrified or dejected by this excommunication, that he returned the compliment to the Roman pontif, and, in a council assembled at *Constantinople*, in the year 866, he declared NICOLAS unworthy both of the place he held in the church, and also of being admitted to the communion of Christians.

XXVIII. The Roman pontif alleged a specious pretext for his appearing in this matter with such violence, and exciting such unhappy commotions in the church. This pretext was the innocence of IGNATIUS, whom, upon an accusation of treason, whether true or false, the emperor had degraded from his patriarchal dignity. This, however, was but a mere pretext; ambition and interest were the true, though secret springs, that directed the motions of NICOLAS, who would have borne with patience, nay, beheld with indifference the unjust sufferings of IGNATIUS, could he

[*w*] In the original there stands 852, but as this is probably an error of the press, the translator has taken the liberty to correct it in the text.

but

CENT.
IX.
PART II.

but have recovered from the Greeks the provinces of *Illyricum, Macedonia, Epirus, Achaia, Thessaly,* and *Sicily*, which the emperor and PHOTIUS had removed from the jurisdiction of the Roman pontif. Before he engaged in the cause of IGNATIUS, he sent a solemn embassy to *Constantinople* to demand the restitution of these provinces; but his demand was rejected with contempt. And hence, under pretence of avenging the injuries committed against IGNATIUS, he indulged without restraint his own private resentment, and thus covered with the mask of justice the fury of disappointed ambition and avarice.

A second
contest
concerning
the same
person.
Photius
degraded.

XXIX. While things were in this troubled state, and the flame of controversy was growing more violent from day to day, BASILIUS the Macedonian, who, by the murder of his predecessor, had paved his way to the imperial throne, calmed at once these tumults, and restored peace to the church, by recalling IGNATIUS from exile to the high station from which he had been degraded, and by confining PHOTIUS in a monastery. This imperial act of authority was solemnly approved and confirmed by a council assembled at *Constantinople* in the year 869, in which the legates of the Roman pontif ADRIAN II. had great influence, and were treated with the highest marks of distinction [x]. The Latins acknowledge this assembly as the eighth *œcumenical* council, and in it the religious contests between them and the Greeks were concluded, or at least hushed and suspended. But the controversy concerning the authority of the Roman pontifs, the limits of their ghostly empire, and particularly their jurisdiction in *Bulgaria*, still subsisted; nor could all the

[x] The writers, on both sides of this controversy, are enumerated by FABRICIUS, in his *Bibl. Græca*, vol. iv. c. xxxviii. p. 372.

efforts

efforts of papal ambition engage either IGNATIUS or the emperor to give up *Bulgaria*, or any other province, to the see of *Rome*.

C E N T.
IX.
P A R T II.

XXX. The contest that had arisen between the Greeks and Latins concerning the elevation of PHOTIUS, was of such a nature as to admit of an easy and effectual remedy. But the haughty and ambitious spirit of this learned and ingenious patriarch fed the flame of discord instead of extinguishing it, and unhappily perpetuated the troubles and divisions of the Christian church. In the year 866, he added to the see of *Constantinople* the province of *Bulgaria*, with which the pontif NICOLAS had formed the design of augmenting his own spiritual dominions, and was most bitterly provoked at missing his aim. PHOTIUS went yet farther; and entered into measures every way unworthy of his character and station; for he not only sent a circular letter to the oriental patriarchs to engage them to espouse his private cause, as the public and momentous cause of the church, but drew up a most violent charge of heresy against the Roman bishops, who had been sent among the new-converted Bulgarians, and against the church of *Rome* in general. The articles of corrupt doctrine, or heresy, which this imperious and exasperated prelate brought against the Romans, were as follow: *First*, That they fasted on the *Sabbath*, or seventh day of the week. *Secondly*, That in the first week of *Lent* they permitted the use of milk and cheese. *Thirdly*, That they prohibited their priests to marry, and separated from their wives such as were married, when they went into orders [*y*]. *Fourthly*, That they maintained

[*y*] PHOTIUS attributes to this forced and unnatural celibacy of the clergy that multitude of children whose fathers were unknown. Remarkable to this purpose is the following passage from a book of ALVARUS DELAGIUS, bishop of
Vol. II. A a Sylva

CEN T. maintained that the bishops alone were authorized
IX. to anoint with the holy chrism baptized persons,
PART II. and that they, of consequence, who had been
anointed by presbyters, were obliged to receive
that unction a second time from the hand of a
bishop. Lastly, That they had adulterated the
symbol or creed of *Constantinople*, by adding to it
the words *filioque*, i. e. *and from the son*, and were
therefore of opinion that the HOLY SPIRIT did
not proceed from the Father only, but also from
the son [z]. NICOLAS I., finding the Roman
church thus attacked, sent the articles of this ac-
cusation to HINCMAR and the other Gallican
bishops in the year 867, desiring them to assemble
their respective suffragans in order to examine and
answer the reproach of PHOTIUS. Pursuant to
this exhortation of the pontif, ODO, AENEAS, and
ADO, bishops of *Beauvais*, *Paris*, and *Vienne*, as
also the celebrated RATRAMN, stepped forth gallantly
into the field of controversy against the Greeks,
answered one by one the accusations of PHOTIUS,
and employed the whole force of their erudition
and zeal in maintaining the cause of the Latin
churches [a].

Sylva in Portugal, De Placitu Ecclesiæ; It were to be wished,
says he, *that the clergy had never vowed chastity, especially*
the clergy of Spain, where the sons of the laity are not much
more numerous than the sons of the clergy.

[z] See the letter of PHOTIUS in the collection published
by bishop MONTAGUE, N. II. p. 47. Other writers mention
ten heads of accusation brought against PHOTIUS, but such
do not distinguish between the first and second controversy
that arose between the Greeks and Latins, and they add to
the articles, with which this patriarch was charged, those that
were drawn up in the time of MICHAEL CERULARIUS. Cer-
tain it is, that in the epistle of PHOTIUS, which relates only
to the first controversy, and is the only criterion by which
we ought to judge of it, there are no more heads of accusa-
tion than the five which we have enumerated in the text.

[a] MABILLON, *Præf. ad Sæc. iv. Bened.* part II. p. 55.

XXXI. Upon the death of IGNATIUS, which happened in the year 878, the emperor took PHOTIUS into favour, and placed him again at the head of the Greek church in the patriarchal dignity from whence he had fallen. This restoration of the degraded patriarch was agreed to by the Roman pontif JOHN VIII., upon condition, however, that PHOTIUS would permit the Bulgarians to come under the jurisdiction of the see of *Rome*. The latter promised to satisfy in this the demands of the pontif, to which the emperor also seemed to consent [b]; and hence it was that JOHN VIII. sent legates to the council which was held at *Constantinople* A. D. 879, by whom he declared his approbation of the acts of that assembly, and acknowledged PHOTIUS as his brother in CHRIST. The promises, however, of the emperor and the patriarch were far from being accomplished; for after this council the former, most probably by the advice, or at least with the consent of the latter, refused to transfer the province of *Bulgaria* to the Roman pontif; and it must be confessed that this refusal was founded upon most weighty and important reasons. The pontif, notwithstanding, was highly irritated at this disappointment, and sent MARINUS to *Constantinople* in the character of legate, to declare that he had changed his mind concerning PHOTIUS, and that he entirely approved of the sentence of excommunication that had been formerly given against him. The legate, upon delivering this disagreeable message, was cast into prison by the emperor, but was afterwards set free; and being raised to the Pontificate upon the death of JOHN VIII., recalled the remembrance of this injurious treatment, and levelled a new sentence of condemnation against PHOTIUS.

CENT.
IX.
PART II.

Restored to
his see.

[b] MICH. LE QUIEN, *Oriens Christianus*, tom. i. p. 103.

C E N T.
IX.
P A R T II.

XXXII. This sentence was treated with contempt by the haughty patriarch; but about six years after this period, he experienced anew the fragility of sublunary grandeur and elevation, by a fall which concluded his prosperous days. For in the year 886, LEO, surnamed the *Philosopher*, the son and successor of BASILIUS, deposed him from the patriarchal see, and confined him in an Armenian monastery, where he died in the year 891. The death of PHOTIUS, who was the only author of the schisms that divided the Greeks and Latins, might have been an occasion of removing these unhappy contests, and of restoring peace and concord in the church, if the Roman pontiffs had not been regardless of the demands of equity, as well as of the duty of Christian moderation. But these imperious lords of the church indulged their vindictive zeal beyond all measure, and would be satisfied with nothing less than the degradation of all the priests and bishops, who had been ordained by PHOTIUS. The Greeks, on the other hand, were shocked at the arrogance of these unjust pretensions, and would not submit to them on any conditions. Hence a spirit of resentment and irritation renewed the spirit of dispute, which had been happily declining; religious, as well as civil contests were again set on foot; new controversies were added to the old, until the fatal schism took place, which produced a lasting and total separation between the Greek and Latin church.

C H A P. IV.

Concerning the rites and ceremonies used in the church during this century.

I. **T**HAT religious rites and ceremonies were multiplied from day to day, appears evidently from the labours of those writers who began in this century to explain to the ignorant multitude their origin, their nature, and the purposes they served; for the multiplicity alone of these religious rites could render the explication of them necessary. JOHANNES SCOTUS, ANGELOME, REMI, or REMIGIUS, bishop of *Auxerre*, and WALAFRIDUS STRABO, were the principal authors who distinguished themselves in this species of sacred literature, to whom we may add AMALARIVS, many of whose explanations were, however, refuted by AGOBARD and FLORUS. Their works are generally entitled *De Officiis Divinis*, for in the style of this age religious ceremonies were called by that name. The labours of these pious and learned men in illustrating the *ritual* were undoubtedly undertaken with good intentions; but their utility may be well called into question; and it would be bold to affirm that they were not as prejudicial to the church in some respects, as they might be advantageous to it in others. Their books afforded, indeed, a certain sort of spiritual nourishment to the minds of christians in their attendance upon public worship; but this nourishment was both coarse and unwholesome. The reasons alleged for the ceremonies in vogue at this time in the church, and the purposes they were supposed to answer, were, for the most part, not only far-fetched, childish, and ridiculous, but also bore the strongest marks of forgery and fiction. It is also farther observable,

C E N T.
IX.
P A R T II.

Several writers plain the origin of the rites and ceremonies now used in the church.

C E N T. that these illustrations not only encouraged, but
 IX.
 P A R T II. augmented prodigiously, and that to the detriment of real piety, the veneration and zeal of the multitude for external rites and ceremonies. For who would dare to refuse their admiration and reverence to institutions, which they were taught to consider as full of the most mysterious wisdom, and founded upon the most pious and affecting reasons?

A general
 account of
 those rites.

II. It would be endless to enter into an exact enumeration of the various rites and ceremonies, which were now introduced, for the first time, and of which some were adopted by the whole body of Christians, and others only by certain churches. We shall therefore dismiss this matter with the general account which follows, and point out in the notes the sources from whence the curious reader may derive a more particular knowledge of the absurdities of this superstitious age. The carcases of the saints transported from foreign countries, or discovered at home by the industry and diligence of pious or designing priests, not only obliged the rulers of the church to augment the number of festivals or holidays already established, but also to diversify the ceremonies in such a manner, that each saint might have his peculiar worship. And as the authority and credit of the clergy depended much upon the high notion which was generally entertained of the virtue and merit of the saints they had canonized, and presented to the multitude as objects of religious veneration, it was necessary to amuse and surprise the people by a variety of pompous and striking ceremonies, by images and such like inventions, in order to keep up and nourish their stupid admiration for the saintly tribe. Hence the splendor and magnificence that were lavished upon the churches in this century, and the prodigious number of costly pictures and images which

which they were adorned; hence the stately char-
acters, which were enriched with the noblest inventions
of painting and sculpture, and illuminated with
innumerable tapers at noon-day; hence the mul-
titude of processions, the gorgeous and splendid
garments of the priests, and the *masses* that were
celebrated in honour of the saints [c]. Among
other novelties, the feast of *All Saints* was added,
in this century, by GREGORY IV., to the Latin
calendar [d]; and the festival of St. MICHAEL,
which had been long kept with the greatest marks
of devotion and respect by the Orientals and Ita-
lians, began now to be observed more zealously
and universally among the Latin Christians [e].

III. Nor was it only in the solemn acts of reli-
gious worship that superstition reigned with an
unlimited sway; its influence extended even to
the affairs of private life, and was observable in
the civil transactions of men, particularly among
the Latin Christians, who retained with more ob-
stinacy than the Greeks a multitude of customs,
which derived their origin from the sacred rites
of paganism. The barbarous nations, which
were converted to Christianity, could not support
the thoughts of abandoning altogether the laws
and manners of their ancestors, however incon-
sistent they might be with the indispensable de-
mands of the gospel; nay, they persuaded, on the
contrary, the Christians among whom they lived
to imitate their extravagant superstition in this
respect. And this was the true and original
source of those barbarous institutions that pre-

Superstition
insinuates
itself into
the transac-
tions of civil
life.

[c] See JO. FECHTII *Liber Singularis de Missis in honorem Sanctorum*.

[d] See MABILLON, *De re Diplomatica*, p. 537.

[e] The holidays, or festivals of the saints were as yet but
few in number among the Latins, as appears from a poem of
FLORUS, published by MARTENE in the fifth volume of his
Thesaurus Anecdotor. p. 595.

CENT.
IX.
PART II.

vailed among the Latins, during this and the following century, such as the various methods by which it was usual for persons accused to prove their innocence in doubtful cases, either by the trial of cold water [*f*], by single combat [*g*], by „the

☞ [*f*] All these were presumptuous attempts to force the divine providence to declare itself miraculously in favour of the truth. In the trial of *cold water*, the person accused had the right foot and the left hand bound together, and was, in this posture, thrown naked into the water. If he sunk, he was acquitted; but if he floated upon the surface, this was considered as an evidence of guilt. The most respectable authors, ancient and modern, attribute the invention of this superstitious trial to pope EUGENIUS II. and it is somewhat surprising that Mr. BOWER has taken no notice of it in his history of that pontif. BALUZIUS has inserted, in the second volume of his *Capitularia*, the solemn forms of prayer and protestation, that EUGENIUS had caused to be drawn up as an introduction to this superstitious practice, and FLEURY and SPANHEIM look upon that pontif as its first inventor. On the other hand, father LE BRUN, a priest of the oratory, maintains (in his *Histoire Critique des Pratiques Superstitieuses*, tom. II. p. 140, &c. edit. d'Amsterdam), that this custom was much more ancient than EUGENIUS, and his reasons are not unworthy of attention. Be that as it may, this custom was condemned and abrogated at the request, or rather, by the authority of LEWIS THE MEER about the year 829. It was however revived afterwards, and was practised in the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth centuries, as we shall see in the progress of this history. For an account of the trial of *cold water*, Dr. MOSHEIM refers us, in a note, to MABILLON'S *Analekta veteris ævi*, tom. I. p. 47. and ROYER'S *De missis dominicis*, p. 152.

The trial by *duel*, or single combat, was introduced towards the conclusion of the fifth century by GONDEBAUD, king of the Burgundians, after that the abuse of oaths had occasioned the most horrible perjuries, and opened a door to all sorts of injustice. The *duel* was then added to the oath by GONDEBAUD; the successful combatant was supposed to be in the right, and this barbarous test of truth and justice was, in spite of humanity and common sense, adopted by the Lombards, French, and Germans, and derived from them to other nations. It was prohibited first in the year 855, in the third council of *Valence* in *Dauphiny*.

The *fire ordeal* was practised in various ways. The accused either held a burning ball of iron in his hand, or was obliged to walk bare-foot upon heated plow-shares, whose number was

the fire ordeal [*b*], and by the cross [*i*]. It is no longer a question in our days, from whence these methods of deciding dubious cases and accusations

CENT.
IX.
PART II.

increased in proportion to the number or enormity of the crimes imputed to him; and sometimes a glove of red-hot iron was used on this occasion, as we see in the tenth book of the history of *Denmark*, by SAXON the *Grammarian*. If in these trials the person impeached remained unhurt, and discovered no signs of pain, he was discharged as innocent; otherwise he was punished as guilty. The first account we have of Christians appealing to this kind of trial as a proof of their innocence, is that of SIMPLICIUS, bishop of *Aulun*, who lived in the fourth century. This prelate, as the story goes, before his promotion to the episcopal order, had married a wife who loved him tenderly, and who, unwilling to quit him after his advancement, continued to sleep in the same chamber with her spouse. The sanctity of SIMPLICIUS suffered, at least in the voice of fame, by the constancy of his wife's affection, and it was rumoured about, that the holy man, though a bishop, persisted in opposition to the ecclesiastical canons to taste the sweets of matrimony. Upon which the dame, in presence of a great concourse of people, took up a considerable quantity of burning coals, which she held in her cloaths, and applied to her breast, without the least hurt to her person or damage to her garments, as the legend says, and her example being followed by her husband with like success, the silly multitude admired the miracle, and proclaimed the innocence of the loving pair. BRICIUS, or St. BRICE (whom Mr. COLLIER, in his *Ecclesiastical History of England*, vol. i. p. 231, represents by mistake as the first Christian who endeavoured to clear himself in this way) played a trick of much the same nature in the fifth century.

The trial by the *cross* was made by obliging the contending parties to stretch out their arms, and he that continued the longest in this posture gained his cause.

[*g*] JO. LOCCENII *Antiquit. Sueo-Gothicæ*, lib. ii. cap. vii. viii. p. 144. This barbarous method of deciding controversies by *duel* was practised even by the clergy. See JUST. HEN. BOEMERI *Jus Eccles. Protestantium*, tom. v. p. 88.

[*b*] PETR. LAMBECIUS, *Rerum Hamburg.* lib. ii. p. 39.—USSERI *Sylloge Epistol. Hibernicæ*. p. 81.—JOHNSON, *Leges Eccles. Britannicæ*.—MICHXL DE LA ROCHE, *Mémoires Litter. de la Grande Bretagne*, tom. viii. p. 391.

[*i*] See AGOBARDUS, *Contra Judicium Dei*, tom. i. opp. et *Contra legem Gundobadi*. cap. ix. p. 114. HIER. BIGNONIUS, *Ad formulas Marculphi*, cap. xii. BALUZIUS, *Ad Agobardum*, p. 104.

derived

C E N T.
IX.
P A R T II.

derived their origin; all agree that they were mere delusions, drawn from the barbarous rites of paganism [k], and not only opposite to the precepts of the gospel, but absolutely destructive of the spirit of true religion. The pontiffs, however, and the inferior clergy encouraged these odious superstitions, and went so far as to accompany the practice of them with the celebration of the Lord's supper and other rites, in order to give them a christian aspect, and to recommend them to the veneration and confidence of the multitude.

C H A P. V.

Concerning the divisions and heresies that troubled the church during this century.

The ancient
sects still in
being.

I. **T**HE sects, that had sprung up in the earlier ages of the church, subsisted still, without almost any change in their situations or circumstances that is worthy of mention. Such of them as were considerably numerous, fixed their settlements beyond the limits both of the Greek and Latin empires, and thus out of the reach of their enemies. The Nestorians more especially, and the Monophysites, secure under the protection of the Arabians, were extremely industrious in maintaining their credit, and also

[k] STRABO tells us in the fifth book of his *Geography*, that while the sacred rites of the goddess *Ferousa* were celebrated in a grove not far from mount *Soraëe*, several persons, transported with the imaginary presence of this pretended divinity, fell into fits of enthusiasm, and walked bare-footed over heaps of burning coals without receiving the least damage. The historian adds, that a spectacle so extraordinary drew a prodigious concourse of people to this annual solemnity. PLINY relates something of the same nature concerning the *Hirpi*. See his *Nat. Hist.* book vii. ch. ii.

discovered a warm and active zeal in the propagation of Christianity among those who were yet unacquainted with that divine religion. Some learned men are of opinion, that it was only in this century that the Abyssinians or Ethiopians embraced the sentiments of the Monophysites, in consequence of the exhortations addressed to them by the doctors of that sect who resided in *Egypt*. But this is undoubtedly a wrong account of the matter; for it is certain, that the Abyssinians, who were accustomed to receive their spiritual guide from the bishop of *Alexandria*, commenced Monophysites in the seventh century, if not sooner. For in that period the Arabians made themselves masters of *Egypt*, oppressed the Greeks, and granted to the Monophysites such a powerful protection, as enabled them to reduce under their jurisdiction almost all the churches that had been established in *Egypt* [1].

II. The Greeks, during the greatest part of this century, were engaged in a most bitter controversy, or, to speak more properly, in a bloody and barbarous war with the Paulicians, a sect that may be considered as a branch of the Manichæans, and which resided principally in *Armenia*. This pernicious sect is said to have been formed in *Armenia* by two brothers PAUL and JOHN, sons of CALLINICES, and inhabitants of *Samosatena*, from the former of whom it derives its name; though others are of opinion, that the Paulicians were so called from another PAUL, an Armenian by birth, who lived under the reign of JUSTINIAN II. [m] Be that as it may, a certain zealot called CONSTANTINE ~~received~~ in the seventh century,

The Pauli-
cians.

[1] *Nouveaux Memoires de la Compagnie de Jesus dans le Levant*, tom. iv. p. 283, 284.—LE GRAND, *Dissert.* iv.—LOBO, *Voyage Historique de l'Abyssinie*, tom. ii. p. 18.

[m] PHOTIUS, lib. 1. *Contra Manichæos*, p. 74. in B. WOLFII, *Anecdosis Græcis*, tom. i.

C E N T.
IX.
PART II.

under the government of CONSTANS, this drooping faction, which had suffered deeply from the violence of its adversaries, and was ready to expire under the severity of the imperial edicts, and of those penal laws which were executed against its adherents with the utmost rigour. CONSTANS, JUSTINIAN II., and LEO the Isaurian, exerted their zeal against the Paulicians with a peculiar degree of bitterness and fury, and left no method of oppression unemployed, no means of accomplishing their ruin that were not put in execution; but their efforts were ineffectual, nor could all their power nor all their barbarity, exhaust the patience, or conquer the obstinacy of that inflexible people, who, with a fortitude worthy of a better cause, made light of the calamities to which their erroneous doctrine exposed them. The face of things changed however, to their advantage towards the commencement of this century, and their affairs carried a more prosperous aspect under the protection of the emperor NICEPHORUS, who favoured them in a particular manner, and restored to them their civil privileges, as well as their religious liberty [n].

Persecuted
anew.

III. Their tranquillity, however, was but of short duration; it was a transient scene that was soon to be succeeded by yet more dreadful sufferings than they had hitherto experienced. The cruel rage of persecution, which had for some years been suspended, broke forth with redoubled violence under the reigns of MICHAEL CUROPALATES, and LEO the Armenian, who caused the strictest search to be made after the Paulicians in all the provinces of the ~~Byzantine~~ ^{Eastern} empire, and inflicted capital punishment upon such of them as refused to return to the bosom of the church.

[*] See GEORG. CEDRENIUS, *Compend. Historiar.* tom. ii. p. 480. *Edit. Paris.* p. 379.

This

This rigorous decree turned the affliction of the Paulicians, who dwelt in *Armenia*, into vengeance, and drove them into the most desperate measures. They massacred THOMAS, bishop of *New Casarea*, and also the magistrates and judges which the emperors had established in *Armenia*; and after avenging themselves thus cruelly, they took refuge in the countries that were governed by the Saracens, and from thence infested the neighbouring states of *Greece* with perpetual incursions [o]. After these reciprocal acts of cruelty and vengeance, the Paulicians, as it would seem, enjoyed an interval of tranquillity, and returned to their habitations in the Grecian provinces.

IV. But the most dreadful scene of persecution and bloodshed that was exhibited against these wretched heretics, arose from the furious and inconsiderate zeal of the empress THEODORA. This impetuous woman, who was regent of the empire during the minority of her son, issued out a decree, which placed the Paulicians in the perplexing alternative either of abandoning their principles, or of perishing by fire and sword. The decree was severe, but the cruelty with which it was put in execution by those who were sent into *Armenia* for that purpose, was horrible beyond expression; for these ministers of wrath, after confiscating the goods of above an hundred thousand of that miserable people, put their possessors to death in the most barbarous manner, and made them expire slowly in a variety of the most exquisite tortures. Such as escaped destruction fled for protection and refuge to the Saracens, who received them with compassion and humanity, and permitted them to build a city for their residence, which was called *Tibrica*. Upon this they entered

The fate of
the Pauli-
cians under
Theodora.

[o] PHOTIUS, lib. i. *Contra Manichæos*, p. 125. PETRI SICULI *Historia Manichæorum*, p. 71.

C E N T. into a league with the Saracens, and, chusing for
IX. their chief an officer of the greatest resolution and
P A R T II. valour, whose name was CARBEAS, they declared
against the Greeks a war which was carried on
with the utmost vehemence and fury. This
bloody war continued during this whole century;
the victory seemed often doubtful, but the slaughter
was terrible, and the numbers that perished on
both sides prodigious. Many of the Grecian
provinces felt, in a more particular manner, the
dire effects of this cruel contest, and exhibited
the most moving scenes of desolation and misery [p]. During these commotions, some Paulicians, towards the conclusion of this century, spread abroad among the Bulgarians their pestilential doctrines, which were received with docility, and took root speedily, as might naturally be expected, among a barbarous people that were

[p] GEORG. CEDRENIUS, *Compend. Hist.* p. 541. *Ed. Paris.* p. 425. *Ed. Venet.* p. 547, et 429, &c. ZONARUS, *Annal.* lib. xvi. tom. ii. p. 122. *Ed. Venet.* The principal authors who have given accounts of the Paulicians are PHOTIUS, lib. i. *Contra Manichæos*, and PETRUS SICULUS, whose history of the Manichæans was published in Greek and Latin at *Ingoldstadt*, in 1604, by MATTH. RADERUS. By the account of PETRUS SICULUS that is given by himself, we learn that in the year 870, under the reign of BASILIUS the Macedonian, he was sent ambassador to the Paulicians at *Tibrica*, to treat with them concerning the exchange of prisoners, and lived among them during the space of nine months; this is sufficient to give us a high idea of the power and prosperity of the Paulicians at that time. It is from this eminent writer that CEDRENIUS seems to have taken what he has advanced in his *Compend. Histor.* p. 431. What we learn concerning the Paulicians from more modern writers, such as BAYLE, in his *Dictionary*, and B. JO. CHRIST. WOLFIUS, in his *Manichæismus ante Manichæos*, p. 247, seems to be derived from BOSSUET's *Histoire des Variations des Eglises Protestantes*, tom. ii. p. 129. But this authority is highly exceptionable; for BOSSUET himself did not consult the true sources of knowledge upon this point; and, what is still worse, the spirit of party seems manifestly to have led him into voluntary errors.

but

but lately made converts to the Christian faith [q].

V. The Greeks treated the Paulicians, of whom we have been now speaking, as Manichæans; though, if we may credit the testimony of PHOTIUS, the Paulicians expressed the utmost abhorrence of MANES and his doctrine [r]. Most evident it is, that they were not altogether Manichæans, though they embraced some opinions that resembled certain tenets of that abominable sect. They had not, like the Manichæans, an ecclesiastical government administered by bishops, priests, and deacons: they had no sacred order of men distinguished by their manner of life, their habit, or any other circumstance from the rest of the assembly: nor had councils, synods, or such like institutions any place in their religious polity. They had certain doctors whom they called *Sunecдеми*, i. e. companions in the journey of life, and also *Notarii*. Among these there reigned a perfect equality, and they had no peculiar rights, privileges, nor any external mark of dignity to distinguish them from the people [s]. The only singularity that attended their promotion to the rank of doctors was, that they changed their lay-names for scripture ones, as if there had been something peculiarly venerable in the names of the holy men, whose lives and actions are recorded

CENT.

IX.

PART II.

Whether or
not the
Paulicians
were Mani-
chæans.

[q] It is not improbable that there are yet in *Thrace* and *Bulgaria*, Paulicians, or Paulians as they are called by some. It appears at least certain, that in the last century some of that sect still subsisted, and dwelt at *Nicopolis*, as we learn from the testimony of URB. CERRI, in his *Etat présent de l'Eglise Romaine*, p. 72, who tells us, that PETER DEODATI, archbishop of *Cophia*, caused them to abandon their errors, and return to the catholic faith; but whether this latter part of the account be true or false, is more than we shall pretend to determine.

[r] PHOTIUS, lib. i. *Contra Manichæos*, p. 17. 56. 65.—PETR. SICULUS, *Hist. Manich.* p. 43.

[s] PHOTIUS, l. c. p. 31, 32. PETR. SICUL. p. 44. CEDRENUS, l. c. p. 431.

CENT. in the sacred writings. They received all the
 IX. books of the New Testament, except the Two
 PART II. Epistles of St. PETER, which they rejected for
 reasons unknown to us; and their copies of the
 Gospel were exactly the same with those used by
 all other Christians, without the least interpolation
 of the sacred text; in which respect also they dif-
 fered considerably from the Manichæans [r].
 They moreover recommended to the people with-
 out exception, and that with the most affecting
 and ardent zeal, the constant and assiduous per-
 usal of the holy scriptures, and expressed the ut-
 most indignation against the Greeks, who allowed
 to the priests alone an access to these sacred foun-
 tains of divine knowledge [u]. In explaining,
 however, the doctrines of the gospel, they often
 departed from the literal sense, and the natural
 signification of the words, and interpreted them
 in a forced and allegorical manner, when they
 opposed their favourite opinions and tenets [w];
 and such more especially were the delusive and
 erroneous explications, which they gave of what
 is said in the gospel concerning the institutions of
 baptism and the Lord's supper, and the divine
 authority of the Old Testament, all which they
 obstinately rejected. Besides the books of the
 New Testament, they treated with a particular
 veneration certain epistles of SERGIUS, the most
 eminent and illustrious doctor of their sect.

The opini-
 ons of the
 Paulicians.

VI. None of the Greek writers have given a
 complete view of the Paulician system, which
 was undoubtedly composed of a great variety of
 tenets; they content themselves with mentioning
 six monstrous errors, which, in their estimation,
 rendered the Paulicians unworthy of enjoying
 either the comforts of this world, or the happi-

[r] PHOTIUS, l. c. p. 11.—PETR. SICUL. p. 19.

[u] PHOTIUS, l. c. p. 101.—PETR. SICUL. p. 57.

[w] PHOTIUS, l. c. p. 12.

ness of the next. *These errors are as follows;

1. "They deny that this inferior and visible world is the production of the Supreme Being, and they distinguish the creator of this world and of human bodies from the most high God, who dwells in the heavens." It was principally on account of this odious doctrine, which was, however, adopted by all the Gnostic sects, that the Paulicians were looked upon as Manichæans by the Greeks. But what their sentiments were concerning the Creator of this world, and whether or not they considered him as a Being distinct from the evil principle, are matters that no writer has hitherto explained in a satisfactory manner. We learn only from PHOTIUS, that, according to the Paulician doctrine, the *evil principle* was engendered by *darkness* and *fire*: from whence it plainly follows that he was neither self-originated, nor eternal [x].
2. "They treated contemptuously the Virgin MARY;" that is to say, according to the manner of speaking usual among the Greeks, they refused to adore and worship her. They maintained, indeed, that CHRIST was the son of MARY, and was born of her (although they maintained, as appears from the ex-

[x] PHOTIUS, lib. ii. *Contra Manichæos*, p. 147. It is evident, beyond all contradiction, that the Paulicians, in imitation of the Oriental philosophers, from whom the Gnostics and Manichæans derived their origin, considered *eternal matter* as the seat and source of all evil; but they believed at the same time, like many of the Gnostics, that this *matter*, endued from all eternity with life and motion, had produced an active principle, which was the fountain of vice, misery, and disorder. This principle, according to them, is the author of all material substances; while God is the creator and father of spirits. These tenets resemble, no doubt, the Manichæan doctrine; yet they differ from it in several points. It appears most probable, that the Paulicians were a branch of some of the ancient Gnostic sects, which were extremely numerous and diversified, and which, though persecuted and oppressed from age to age in the most rigorous manner by many emperors, could never be entirely suppressed, nor totally extirpated.

CENT.
IX.
PART II.

press testimony of their adversaries, that the divine Saviour brought with him from heaven his human nature, and that MARY, after the birth of CHRIST, had other children by JOSEPH; they only fell into the sentiments of the Valentinians, and held that CHRIST passed through the womb of the Virgin, as the pure stream of limpid water passes through a conduit, and that MARY did not preserve her virginity to the end of her days; all which assertions the Greeks rejected with the utmost antipathy and abhorrence. 3. "They refused to celebrate the holy institution of the " Lord's supper;" for as they looked upon many precepts and injunctions of the gospel to be of a merely figurative and parabolical nature, so they understood by the bread and wine, which CHRIST is said to have administered to his disciple, at his last supper, the divine discourses and exhortations of the Saviour, which are a spiritual food and nourishment to the soul, and fill it with repose, satisfaction, and delight [y]. 4. "They loaded " the cross of CHRIST with contempt and reproach;" by which we are only to understand, that they refused to follow the absurd and superstitious practice of the Greeks, who paid to the pretended wood of the cross a certain sort of religious homage. As the Paulicians believed that CHRIST was clothed with an ethereal, impassible, and celestial body, they could by no means grant that he was *really* nailed to the cross, or that he expired, in effect, upon that ignominious tree: and hence naturally arose that treatment of the

[y] The Greeks do not charge the Paulicians with any error concerning *baptism*; it is however certain, that the accounts of that sacred institution, which are given in scripture, were allegorically explained by this extravagant sect; and PHOTIUS, in his *First Book against the Manicheans*, p. 29. expressly asserts, that the Paulicians treated baptism as a mere allegorical ceremony, and by the baptismal water understood the *gospel*,

cross

cross of which the Greeks accused them. 5. "They ^{C E N T.} rejected, after the example of the greatest part ^{IX.} of the Gnostics, the books of the Old Testa- ^{PART II.} ment, and looked upon the writers of that sacred history as inspired by the creator of this world, and not by the supreme God. 6. They excluded presbyters and elders from all part in the administration of the church." By this, however, no more can be meant, than that they refused to call their doctors by the name of *Presbyters*, a name which had its origin among the Jews, and was peculiar to that odious people who persecuted JESUS CHRIST, and attempted, as the Paulicians speak, to put him to death [z].

[z] These six famous errors of the Paulicians I have taken from the Manichaean history of PETRUS SICULUS, with whom PHOTIUS and CERDANUS agree, although their accounts of these opinions be less perspicuous and distinct. The explanatory remarks that I have added, are the result of my own reflexions upon the Paulician system, and the doctrine of the Greeks.

T H E
T E N T H C E N T U R Y .

P A R T I .

The External HISTORY of the CHURCH.

C H A P T E R I .

*Concerning the prosperous events which happened to
the Church during this century.*

C E N T .
X.
P A R T I .

The propa-
gation of
the Chris-
tian reli-
gion.

I. **T**HE deplorable state of christianity in this century, arising partly from that astonishing ignorance that gave a loose rein both to superstition and immorality, and partly from an unhappy concurrence of causes of another kind, is unanimously lamented by the various writers, who have transmitted to us the history of these miserable times. Yet amidst all this darkness some gleams of light were perceived from time to time, and several occurrences happened, which deserve a place in the prosperous annals of the church. The Nestorians in *Chaldæa* extended their spiritual conquests beyond mount *Imaus*, and introduced the Christian religion into *Tartary*, properly so called, whose inhabitants had hitherto lived in their natural state of ignorance and ferocity, uncivilized and savage. The same successful missionaries spread, by degrees, the knowledge of the gospel among that most powerful nation of the Turks, or Tartars, which went by the name

name of *Karit*, and bordered on *Katbay*, or on the northern part of *China* [a]. The laborious industry of this sect, and their zeal for the propagation of the Christian faith, deserve, no doubt, the highest encomiums; it must, however, be acknowledged, that the doctrine and worship, which they introduced among these Barbarians, were far from being, in all respects, conformable to the precepts of the gospel, or to the true spirit and genius of the Christian religion.

II. The prince of that country, whom the Nestorians converted to the Christian faith, assumed, if we may give credit to the vulgar tradition, the name of *JOHN* after his baptism, to which he added the surname of *Presbyter*, from a principle of modesty. Hence it was, as some learned men imagine, that the successors of this monarch retained these names until the time of *GENGIS KAN*, who flourished in the fourteenth century, and were each of them called *PRESTER JOHN* [b]. But all this has a very fabulous air; at least it is advanced without any solid proof; nay, it appears evident, on the contrary, that the famous *PRESTER JOHN*, who made so much noise in the world, did not begin to reign in that part of *Asia* before the conclusion of the eleventh century. It is, however, certain beyond all contradiction, that the monarchs of the nation called *Karit*, which makes a large part of the empire of the Mogul, and is by some denominated a province of the *Turks*, and by others a tribe of the *Tartars*, embraced Christianity in this century; and that a considerable part of *Tartary*, or *Asiatic Scythia*, lived under the spiritual jurisdiction

CENT.
X.
PART I.

Prester
John,

[a] JOS. SIM. ASSEMANNI *Bibliotheca Oriental Vatic.* tom. iii. part II. p. 482. — HERBELOT, *Bibliothèque Oriental*, p. 256.

[b] See ASSEMANNI *Biblioth. Oriental. Vatic.* tom. iii. part II. p. 282.

C E N T. of bishops who were sent among them by the
 X. Nestorian pontif [c].
 P A R T I.

Rollo first
 duke of
 Normandy
 converted.

III. If we turn our eyes to the western world, we shall find the gospel making its way with more or less rapidity through the most rude and uncivilized nations. The famous arch-pirate ROLLO, son of a Norwegian count, being banished from his native land [d], had, in the preceding century, put himself at the head of a resolute band of Normans, and seized upon one of the maritime provinces of *France*, from whence he infested the whole country round about with perpetual incursions and depredations. In the year 912, this valiant chief embraced, with his whole army, the Christian faith, and that upon the following occasion: CHARLES the Simple, who wanted both resolution and power to drive this warlike and intrepid invader out of his dominions, was obliged to have recourse to the method of negotiation. He accordingly offered to make over to ROLLO a considerable part of his territories, upon condition that the latter would consent to a peace, espouse his daughter GISELA [e], and embrace Christianity. These terms were accepted by ROLLO without the least hesitation; and his army,

[c] The late learned Mr. B. THEOPHILUS SIGEFRED BAYER, in his *Preface to the Museum Sinicum*, p. 145, informed us of his design to give the world an accurate account of the Nestorian churches established in *Tartary* and *China*, drawn from some curious ancient records and monuments, that have not been as yet made public. His work was to have been entitled *Historia Ecclesiarum Sinicarum, et Septentrionalis Asiae*; but death prevented the execution of this interesting plan, and also of several others, which this great man had formed, and which would have undoubtedly cast a new light upon the history of the Asiatic Christians.

[d] HOIBERG *Historia Danorum Navalis in Scriptis Societat. Scient. Hafniens.* part III. p. 357.

[e] Other writers more politely represent the offer of GISELA as one of the methods that CHARLES employed to obtain a peace with ROLLO.

following

following the example of their leader, professed a religion of which they were totally ignorant [f]. These Norman pirates, as appears from many authentic records, were absolutely without religion of every kind, and therefore were not restrained, by the power of prejudice, from embracing a religion which presented to them the most advantageous prospects. They knew no distinction between interest and duty, and they estimated truth and virtue only by the profits with which they were attended. It was from this ROLLO, who received at his baptism the name of ROBERT, that the famous line of Norman dukes derived its origin; for the province of *Bretagne*, and a part of *Neustria*, which CHARLES the Simple conveyed to his son-in-law by a solemn grant, were, from this time, known by the name of *Normandy* [g], which they derived from their new possessors.

CENT.
X.
PART I.

IV. The Christian religion was introduced into *Poland* by the zealous efforts of female piety. DAMBROWKA, daughter of BOLISLAUS, duke of *Bohemia*, persuaded, by the force of repeated exhortations, her husband MICISLAUS, duke of *Poland*, to abandon paganism, in consequence of which he embraced the gospel A.D. 965. The account of this agreeable event was no sooner brought to *Rome*, than the pontif, JOHN XIII., sent into *Poland* ÆGIDIUS, bishop of *Usculum*, attended with a numerous train of ecclesiastics, in order to second the pious efforts of the duke and duchess, who desired, with impatience, the conversion of their subjects. But the exhortations and endeavours of these devout missionaries, who

The conversion of
the Polish
nation.

[f] BOULAY, *Hist. Acad. Paris* tom. i. p. 296.—DANIEL, *Hist. de France*, tom. ii. p. 587.

[g] It was *Neustria* properly, and not *Bretagne*, that received the name of *Normandy*, from the Normans who chose ROLLO for their chief.

CENT.
X.
PART I.

were unacquainted with the language of the people they came to instruct, would have been entirely without effect, had they not been accompanied with the edicts and penal laws, the promises and threats of MICISLAUS, which dejected the courage, and conquered the obstinacy of the reluctant Poles. When therefore the fear of punishment, and the hope of reward, had laid the foundations of Christianity in *Poland*, two national archbishops and seven bishops were consecrated to the ministry, whose zeal and labours were followed with such success, that the whole body of the people abandoned, by degrees, their ancient superstitions, and made public profession of the religion of JESUS [b]. It was indeed no more than an external profession; for that inward change of affections and principles, which the gospel requires, was far from being an object of attention in this barbarous age.

The Christian religion
established
in Moscow,

V. The Christian religion was established in *Russia* by means every way similar to those that had occasioned its propagation in *Poland*; for we must not lay any stress upon the profelytes that were made to Christianity among the Russians in the preceding century; since these conversions were neither permanent nor solid, and since it appears evidently, that such of that nation, as, under the reign of BASILIUS the Macedonian, had embraced the doctrine of the Greek church, relapsed soon after into the superstition of their ancestors. WLODOMIR, duke of *Russia* and *Moscow*, married, in the year 961, ANNE, sister of BASILIUS, the second Grecian emperor of that name; and this zealous princess, by her repeated entreaties, and her pious importunity, persuaded at length her reluctant spouse to receive the Christ-

[b] DUGLOSSI *Historia Polonica*, lib. ii. p. 91. lib. iii. p. 95. 239.—REGENVOLSCII *Historia Eccles. Slavon.* lib. i. cap. i. p. 8.—HENR. CANISII *Lectiones Antiquæ*, tom. iii. part I. p. 41.—SOLIGNAC, *Hist. de Pologne*, tom. i. p. 71.

ian faith, and he was accordingly baptized, A. D. ^{C. X.} 987, assuming upon that occasion the name of ^{R. A. R. I.} BASILIUS. The Russians followed spontaneously the example of their prince; we have, at least, no account of any compulsion or violence being employed in their conversion [i], and this is the true date of the entire establishment of Christianity among that people. WLODOMIR and his duchess were placed in the highest order of the Russian saints, and are still worshipped at *Kiowia*, where they lie interred, with the greatest devotion. The Latins, however, paid no such respect to the memory of WLODOMIR, whom they represent as absolutely unworthy of saintly honours [k].

VI. The Hungarians and Avari had received and in
Hungary. some faint notions of Christianity under the reign of CHARLEMAGNE, and in consequence of the measures that had been taken by that zealous prince for the propagation of the gospel. These notions, however, were soon and easily extinguished by various circumstances, which took their rise from the death of CHARLEMAGNE; and it was not before the century, of which we now write, that the Christian religion obtained a fixed settlement among these warlike nations [l]. Towards the middle of this century, BULOSUPES and GYVLA, or GYLAS, two Turkish chiefs, whose governments lay upon the banks of the *Danube* [m], made public profession of Christianity and were baptized at *Constantinople*. The former apostatized soon after to the religion of his ancestors;

[i] See ANTON. PAGI *Critica in Baron.* tom. iv. ad A. 987, p. 55. et ad A. 1015, p. 110. CAR. DU FRESNE, *Familia Byzantine*, p. 143. ed. Paris.

[k] DITMARUS, *Merseb.* lib. vii. *Caronic.* p. 417. tom. i. *Scriptor. Brunsvic. Leibnitii.*

[l] PAULI DEBŒZEMII *Historia Eccles. Reformat. in Ungaria*, part l. cap. iii. p. 19.

[m] The Hungarians and Transylvanians were, at this time, known to the Grecians by the name of Turks.

while

CENT.
X.
PART I.

while the latter not only persevered stedfastly in his new profession, but also shewed the most zealous concern for the conversion of his subjects, who, in consequence of his express order, were instructed in the doctrines and precepts of the gospel by HIEROTHEUS, a learned prelate, by whom he had been accompanied in his journey to *Constantinople*. SAROLTA, the daughter of GYLAS, was afterwards given in marriage to GEYSA, the chief of the Hungarian nation, whom she persuaded to embrace the divine religion in which she had been educated. The faith, however, of this new-converted prince was feeble and unsteady, and he retained a strong propensity to the superstition which he had been engaged to forsake; but his apostasy was prevented by the pious remonstrances of ADALBERT, archbishop of *Prague*, who came into *Hungary* towards the conclusion of this century, and by whom also STEPHEN, the son of GEYSA, was baptized with great pomp and solemnity. It was to this young prince that the gospel was principally indebted for its propagation and establishment among the Hungarians, whose entire conversion was the fruit of his zeal for the cause of CHRIST. For he perfected, what his father and grandfather had only begun; fixed bishops, with large revenues, in various places; erected magnificent temples for divine worship; and, by the influence of instructions, threatenings, rewards, and punishments, he brought his subjects, almost without exception, to abandon the wretched superstition of their idolatrous ancestors. These vigorous proceedings, by which STEPHEN introduced the religion of Jesus among the Hungarians, procured him the most distinguished honours of saintship in succeeding ages [n].

VII. The

[n] The Greeks, Germans, Bohemians, and Poles, claim each for themselves the peculiar honour of having been the
founders

VII. The Christian religion was in a very unsettled state among the Danes under the reign of GORMON, and, notwithstanding the protection it received from his queen, who professed it publicly, was obliged to struggle with many difficulties, and to encounter much opposition. The face of things changed, indeed, after the death of GORMON. His son HARALD, surnamed *Blaaland*, being defeated by OTHO the Great, A. D. 949, embraced the gospel, and was baptized together with his consort and his son SUENO, or SWEIN, by ADALDAGUS, archbishop of *Hamburg*, or, as others allege, by POPPON, a pious ecclesiastic, who attended the emperor in this expedition. It is probable that HARALD, educated by his mother TYRA, who was a Christian, was not extremely averse to the religion of Jesus; it appears, however, certain, that his conversion was less the effect of his own choice, than of the irresistible commands of his victorious enemy. For OTHO, persuaded that the Danes would never desist from

founders of the Christian religion in *Hungary*, and their respective pretensions have introduced not a little obscurity into this matter. The Germans allege, that the Christian religion was brought into *Hungary* by GISELA, sister to their emperor HENRY II., who, being given in marriage to STEPHEN, the king of that nation, persuaded that prince to embrace the gospel. The Bohemians tell us, on the other hand, that it was by the ministry of ADALBERT, archbishop of *Prague*, that STEPHEN was converted. The Poles affirm, that GEYSA, having married a Christian Princess of their nation, viz. ADELHEID, sister to MICSLAS, duke of *Poland*, was induced by her remonstrances and exhortations to make profession of Christianity. In consequence of a careful examination of all these pretensions, we have followed the sentiments and decisions of the Greek writers, after having diligently compared them with the Hungarian historians; and we are encouraged in this by the authority of the learned GABRIEL DE JUXTA HORNAD, who, in his *Initia Religionis Christianæ inter Hungaros Ecclesiæ orientali adjecta*, published at *Frankfort* in 1740, decides this question in favour of the Greeks. All other accounts of the matter are extremely imperfect, and subject to many doubts and difficulties.

their

CEN. T.
X.
PART I.

their hostile incursions and rapines, as long as they persevered in the religion of their ancestors, which was so proper to nourish a ferocity of temper, and to animate to military exploits, made it the principal condition of the treaty of peace, which he concluded with HARALD, that both he and his subjects should receive the Christian faith [o]. Upon the conversion of this prince, ADALDAGUS and POPPON employed their ministerial labours among the Cimbrians and Danes, in order to engage them to imitate such an illustrious example; and their exhortations were crowned with remarkable success, to which the stupendous miracles performed by POPPON are said to have contributed in a particular manner. These miracles, indeed, were of such a kind, as manifestly shews that they derived their origin from human art, and not from a divine interposition [p]. As long as HARALD lived, he used every wise and probable method of confirming his subjects in the religion they had embraced. For this purpose he established bishops in several parts of his dominions, enacted excellent laws, abrogated superstitious customs, and imposed severe restraints upon all vicious and immoral practices. But after all these pious efforts, and salutary measures, which promised such fair prospects to the rising church, his son SUENO, or SWEIN, apostatized from the truth, and, during a certain time, involved the Christians in the deepest calamity

[o] ADAM *Brem. Hist.* lib. ii. cap. ii. iii. p. 16. cap. xv. p. 20. in LINDENBROGII *Scriptoribus rerum Septentrional.*—ALB. KRANZII *Wandalia*, lib. iv. cap. xx.—LUDWIGII *Reliquiæ Manuscriptor.* tom. ix. p. 10.—PONTOPPIDANI *Annales Ecclesiæ Diplomatici*, tom. i. p. 59.

[p] JO. ADOLPH. CUPRÆI *Annales Episcoporum Sleswic.* cap. xiii. p. 78.—ADAM *Bremens.* lib. ii. cap. xxvi. p. 22. cap. xlv. p. 28.—JO. STEPHAN. *ad Saxonem Grammat.* p. 207.—MOLIERI *Introduct. ad Historiam Chersonesæ Cemblic.* part II. cap. iii. § 14.

and distress, and treated them with the greatest cruelty and injustice. This persecuting tyrant felt, however, in his turn, the heavy strokes of adversity, which produced a salutary change in his conduct, and happily brought him to a better mind; for being driven from his kingdom, and obliged to seek his safety in a state of exile among the Scots, he embraced anew the religion he had abandoned, and upon his restoration to his dominions, exerted the most ardent and exemplary zeal in the cause of Christianity, which he endeavoured to promote to the utmost of his power [q].

VIII. It was in this century, that the first dawn In Norway. of the gospel arose upon the Norwegians, as we learn from the most authentic records. The conversion of that people was attempted, in the year 933, by their monarch HAGEN ADELSTEEN, who had been educated among the English, and who employed certain ecclesiastics of that nation to instruct his subjects in the doctrines of Christianity. But his pious efforts were rendered fruitless by the brutal obstinacy, with which the Norwegians persevered in their ancient prejudices, and the assiduity and zeal with which his successor HARALD GRAUFELDT pursued the same plan of reformation, were also without effect [r]. The succeeding princes, far from being discouraged by these obstacles, persisted firmly in their worthy purpose, and HACO, among others, yielding to the entreaties of HARALD, king of *Denmark*, to whom he was indebted for the Norwegian crown, embraced, himself, the Christian religion, and recommended it, with the greatest fervour, to his subjects, in an assembly of the people that was held in the

[q] SAXON. *Gramm. Hist. Dan.* lib. x. p. 186.—PONTOPPIDAN, *De gestis et vestigiis Danorum extra Daniam*, tom. ii. cap. i. § 1, 2.

[r] ERIC. PONTOPPIDAN, *Annales Eccles. Danicæ diplomat.* tom. i. p. 66.

CENT. year 945 [s]. This recommendation, notwithstanding the solemnity and zeal with which it was accompanied, made little impression upon the minds of this fierce and barbarous people; nor were they entirely gained over by the zealous endeavours of OLAUS to convert them to Christianity, though the pious diligence of that prince, which procured him the honour of sainthood, was not altogether without effect [t]. But that which gave the finishing stroke to the conversion of the Norwegians was their subjection to SUENON, or SWEIN, king of *Sweden*, who, having defeated their monarch OLAUS TRYG GUESON, became master of *Norway*, and obliged its inhabitants to abandon the gods of their ancestors, and to embrace universally the religion of Jesus [u]. Among the

[s] TORM TORÆI *Historia Norwegica*, tom. II. p. 183.

214

[t] TORÆUS, l. c. p. 457.

[u] Dr MOSHEIM attributes here to SWEIN the honour which is due to his predecessor OLAUS TRYG GUESON, if it can be esteemed an honour to have promoted a rational and divine religion by compulsion and violence, by fire and sword. OLAUS, who had abjured paganism in *England* during his youth, in consequence of a war and pathetic discourse which he had heard from a British priest, returned to *Norway* with a firm resolution to propagate Christianity throughout his dominions. For this purpose he travelled from one province to another, attended by a chosen band of soldiers, and sword in hand performed the functions of missionary and apostle. His ministry, thus enforced, was followed with the desired success throughout all the provinces, except that of *Drontheim*, which rose in rebellion against him, and attacked Christianity with the same kind of arguments that OLAUS employed in establishing it. This opposition occasioned several bloody battles, which ended, however, in the defeat of the rebels, and of the god THOR, their tutelary deity, whose statue OLAUS dragged from its place, and burnt publicly in the sight of his worshippers. This event dejected the courage of the inhabitants of *Drontheim*, who submitted to the religion and laws of their conqueror. And thus before the reign of SUENON, at least before the defeat of OLAUS by that prince, *Norway* was christian. See *The History of Denmark*, lately published in French by Mr. MALLET, Professor in *Belle Lettres* at *Copenhagen*, vol. 1. p. 52, 53.

various doctors, that were sent to instruct this barbarous people, the most eminent, both in merit and authority, was GUTHEBALD, an English priest [w]. From *Norway*, Christianity spread its salutary light through the adjacent countries, and was preached, with success, in the *Orkney* islands, which were, at this time, subject to the Norwegian kings, and also in *Iceland* and *Old Groenland*; for it is evident, from many circumstances and records of undoubted authority, that the greatest part of the inhabitants of these countries had received the gospel in this century [x].

IX. In *Germany* the pious exploits of OTHO the Great, contributed, in a signal manner, to promote the interest of Christianity, and to fix and establish it upon solid foundations throughout the empire. This truly great prince, whose pious magnanimity clothed him with a lustre infinitely superior to that which he derived from his imperial dignity, was constantly employed in extirpating the remains of the ancient superstitions, and in supporting and confirming the infant church, which in several provinces had not yet arrived to any considerable degree of consistence and vigour. That there might be rulers and pastors to govern the church, and to contribute both by their doctrine and example to the reformation and improvement of an unpolished and illiterate people, he established bishops in several places, and ge-

The zeal of
Otho the
Great in the
cause of
Christiani-
ty.

[w] *Chron. Danicum* a LUDWIGIO editum in *Reliquis Mstorum*, tom. ix. p. 11. 16, 17.

[x] Concerning the conversion of the inhabitants of the *Or'neys*, see *TORM. TORFÆI Historia Rerum Orcadens* lib. 1. p. 22. and for an account of the Icelanders, the reader may consult ARNGRIM. JONAS's *Cynogæa*, lib. i. and ARIUS *Mult. f. in Schedis Islandia*; as also TORFÆUS, his *Histor. Norveg.* tom. ii. p. 378, 379. 417. and GABRIEL LIKON's *Singularités Historiques et Littéraires*, tom. i. p. 128. The same TORFÆUS gives a full account of the introduction of Christianity into *Groenland*, in his *Histor. Norveg.* tom. ii. p. 374. and also in his *Groenlandia Antiqua*, c. xvii. p. 127.

C E N T. nerously erected and endowed the bishoprics of
 X. *Brandenburg, Havelberg, Meissen, Magdeburg, and*
 PART I. *Naumburg*; by which excellent establishments the
 church was furnished with eminent doctors from
 various parts, whose instructions were the occasion
 of raising up new labourers in the gospel harvest,
 and of thus multiplying the ministers of CHRIST
 from time to time. It was also through the mu-
 nificence of the same prince, that many convents
 were erected for those who, in conformity with
 the false piety of the times, chose to finish their
 Christian course in the indolent sanctity of a solita-
 ry life, and it was by his express order that schools
 were established in almost every city for the edu-
 cation of the youth. All this may serve to shew us
 the generosity and zeal of this illustrious emperor,
 whose merit would have surpassed the highest
 encomiums, had his prudence and moderation
 been equal to the fervour of his piety, and the
 uprightness of his intentions. But the superstition
 of his empress [y], and the deplorable ignorance
 of the times deluded this good prince into the no-
 tion, that he obliged the Deity in proportion as
 he loaded the clergy with riches and honours,
 and that nothing was more proper to draw down
 upon him the divine protection, than the exer-
 cise of a boundless liberality to his ministers.
 In consequence of this idle and extravagant fan-
 cy, OTHO opened the sources of his opulence,
 which flowed into the church like an overgrown
 torrent, so that the bishops, monks, and religious
 houses wallowed in wealth and abundance. But
 succeeding ages perceived the unhappy effects of
 this excessive and ill-judged munificence; when
 the sacred orders employed this opulence, which
 they had acquired without either merit or labour,

[y] See the life of this empress, whose name was ADELAID, in the *Lectiones Antiquæ* of HENRY CANISIUS, tom. iii. part I. p. 69.

in gratifying their passions, in waging war against all who opposed their ambitious pretensions, and in purchasing the various pleasures of a luxurious and effeminate life.

X. It was no doubtful mark of the progress and strength of the Christian cause that the European kings and princes began so early as this century to form the project of a holy war against the Mahometans, who were masters of *Palestine*. They considered it as an intolerable reproach upon Christians, that the very land in which the divine author of their religion had received his birth, exercised his ministry, and made expiation for the sins of mortals, should be abandoned to the enemies of the Christian name. They also looked upon it as highly just, and suitable to the majesty of the Christian religion, to avenge the calamities and injuries, the persecution and reproach, which its professors had suffered under the Mahometan yoke. The bloody signal was accordingly given towards the conclusion of this century, by the Roman pontif SILVESTER II., and that in the first year of his pontificate. And this signal was an epistle, wrote in the name of the church of Jerusalem, to the church universal throughout the world [z], in which the European powers are solemnly exhorted and entreated to succour and deliver the Christians in *Palestine*. The exhortations of the pontif were, however, without effect, except upon the inhabitants of *Pisa*, who are said to have obeyed the papal summons with the utmost alacrity, and to have prepared themselves immediately for a holy campaign [a].

C E N T.
X.
P A R T I.

The plan of
a holy war
formed in
this cen-
tury.

[z] This is the xxviiiith Epistle in the first part of the collection of the letters of SILVESTER II., that is published by DU CHESNE, in the third volume of his *Scriptor. Histor. Franc.*

[a] See MURATORI *Scriptores rerum Italicarum*, tom. iii. p. 400.

C H A P. II.

Concerning the calamitous events that happened to the church during this century.

CENT.
X.
PART I.

The progress of the
Turks and
Saracens.

I. **T**HE Christian religion suffered less in this century from the cruelty of its enemies, than from the defection of its friends. Of all the Pagan monarchs, under whose government the Christians lived, none behaved to them in a hostile manner, nor tormented them with the execution of compulsive edicts or penal laws, except GORMON and SWEIN, kings of *Denmark*. Notwithstanding this, their affairs were far from being either in a fixed or flourishing state; nay, their situation was full of uncertainty and peril, both in the eastern and western provinces. The Saracens in *Asia* and *Africa*, amidst the intestine divisions under which they groaned, and the calamities that overwhelmed them from different quarters, were extremely assiduous in propagating every where the doctrines of MAHOMET, nor were their efforts unsuccessful. Multitudes of Christians fell into their snares; and the Turks, a valiant and fierce nation, who inhabited the northern coast of the *Caspian* sea, received their doctrine. The uniformity of religion did not, however, produce a solid union of interest between the Turks and Saracens; on the contrary, their dissensions and quarrels were never more violent, than from the time that MAHOMET became their common chief in religious matters. The succours of the former were implored by the Persians, whose country was a prey to the ambitious usurpations of the latter, and these succours were granted with the utmost alacrity and readiness. The Turks accordingly fell upon the Saracens in a
furious

furious manner, drove them out of the whole extent of the Persian territories, and afterwards, with incredible rapidity and success, invaded, seized, and plundered the other provinces that belonged to that people, whose desolation, in reality, came on like a whirlwind. Thus the powerful empire of the Saracens, which its enemies had for so many years attempted in vain to overturn, fell at last by the hands of its allies and friends. The Turks accomplished what the Greeks and Romans ineffectually aimed at; they struck suddenly that dreadful blow, which ruined at once the affairs of the Saracens in *Persia*, and then deprived them, by degrees, of their other dominions; and thus the Ottoman empire, which was still an object of terror to the Christians, was established upon the ruins of the Saracen dominion [b].

CENT.
 X.
 PART I.

II. In the western provinces, the Christians had much to suffer from the hatred and cruelty of those who remained under the darkness of paganism. The Normans, during a great part of this century, committed, in several parts of *France*, the most barbarous hostilities, and involved the Christians, wherever they carried their victorious arms, in numberless calamities. The Samaritans, Sclavonians, Bohemians, and others, who had either conceived an aversion for the gospel, or were sunk in a stupid ignorance of its intrinsic excellence and its immortal blessings, not only endeavoured to extirpate Christianity out of their own territories by the most barbarous efforts of cruelty and violence, but infested the adjacent countries, where it was professed, with fire and sword, and left, wherever they went, the most

The western Barbarians persecute the Christians.

[b] For a more ample account of these revolutions, see the *Annales Turcici* of LEUNCLAVIUS; as also GEORGII ELMASINI *Historia Saracenica*, p. 190. 203. 210.

C E N T. dreadful marks of their unrelenting fury. The
 X. Danes, moreover, did not cease to molest the
 PART I. Christians, until they were subdued by OTHO
 the Great, and thus, from being the enemies,
 became the friends of the Christian cause. The
 Hungarians also contributed their part to the
 sufferings of the church, by their incursions into
 several parts of *Germany*, which they turned into
 scenes of desolation and misery; while the fierce
 Arabs, by their tyranny in *Spain*, and their de-
 predations in *Italy* and the neighbouring islands,
 spread calamity and oppression all around them,
 of which, no doubt, the Christians established
 in these parts had the heaviest portion.

The effects
 of these
 calamities.

III. Whoever considers the endless vexations, persecutions, and calamities, which the Christians suffered from the nations that continued in their ancient superstitions, will easily perceive the reason of that fervent and inextinguishable zeal, which Christian princes discovered for the conversion of these nations, whose impetuous and savage fury they experienced from time to time. A principle of self-preservation, and a prudent regard to their own safety, as well as a pious zeal for the propagation of the gospel, engaged them to put in practice every method that might open the eyes of their barbarous adversaries, from a rational and well-grounded hope that the precepts of Christianity would mitigate, by degrees, the ferocity of these nations, and soften their rugged and intractable tempers. Hence it was, that Christian kings and emperors left no means unemployed to draw these infidels within the pale of the church. For this purpose, they proposed to their chiefs alliances of marriage, offered them certain districts and territories, auxiliary troops to maintain them against their enemies, upon condition that they would
 abandon

abandon the superstition of their ancestors, which was so proper to nourish their ferocity, and to encreate their passion for blood and carnage. These offers were attended with the desired success, as they induced the infidel chiefs not only to lend an ear themselves to the instructions and exhortations of the Christian missionaries, but also to oblige their subjects and armies to follow their examples in this respect.

CENT.
X.
PART I.
